

Vol. LII

No. 189

# The Church Review

EDITED BY THE

Rev. Henry Mason Baum

OCTOBER, 1888

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. The Issue in South Carolina. General Edward McCrady, Jr.	305
II. Proportional Representation in the House of Deputies. Rev. Prof. William Lawrence, M. A.	330
III. Mr. Crawford's Latest Novels. G. E. Meredith.	343
IV. The Study of the Christian Fathers. Rev. Arthur Lowades.	350
V. Decay of Rural Life in New England. Rev. William Wilberforce Newton, M. A.	364
VI. Are Parochial Missions Valuable Aids to the Material and Spiritual Growth of Church Life? And How ought they to be Conducted?	373

## WRITERS

Rev. Arthur Brooks, M. A., Rector of the Church of the Incarnation, New York; Rev. Arthur C. A. Hall, M. A., Rector of the Church of S. John the Evangelist, Boston; Rev. Samuel D. McConnell, D.D., Rector of S. Stephen's Church, Phila.; Rev. William Wilberforce Newton, M. A., Rector of S. Stephen's Church, Pittsfield, Mass.; Rev. Henry Y. Satterlee, D.D., Rector of Calvary Church, New York; Rev. George R. Van De Water, D.D., Rector of the Holy Trinity Church, Harlem, New York.

VII. Contemporary, Ecclesiastical and University History	395
VIII. Necrological Record	413
IX. Contemporary Literature	415

NEW YORK

Henry Mason Baum

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00

SINGLE NUMBER, 35 CENTS



# COX SONS, BUCKLEY & CO

† Church Furnishers, †

343 5TH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

AND LONDON, ENGLAND

ALMS BASINS, COMMUNION PLATE, ALTAR CROSSES,

CANDLESTICKS, VASES, ETC.

LECTERNS, PULPITS, ALTARS, REREDOS.

EMBROIDERIES, ALTAR CLOTHS, DOSSALS.

HANGINGS AND MATERIALS FOR WORKING.

Memorial Brasses, Tombs, etc

STAINED GLASS.

Clerical Clothing, Bishops' and College Robes.

Prices and particulars for self-measurement sent on application.

"ART GARNISHING CHURCHES." \$1.50. New Edition

Designs and Estimates free.

# The Church Review

VOL. LII.—OCTOBER, 1888.—No. CLXXXIX.

## The Issue in South Carolina.

IN undertaking, on the part of at least some of the Laity, to answer the article of the Rev. John Kershaw on the "Issue in South Carolina," appearing in the October 1887 number of THE CHURCH REVIEW, I shall I trust give this earnest of our sincere desire to restore the peace of the Church in this Diocese in that I shall refrain entirely from the tone and temper in which some of the clergy have written on this subject. I shall not be tempted to turn aside from the real issues involved, for the sake of apt replies which come to the point of my pen, to some of Mr. Kershaw's rather unkind comments on the conduct of the Laity. No word, I trust, shall escape me, even by way of retort, to remain an obstacle to the entire restoration of the most cordial relations between the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese. Especially must I be careful of this, as in a communication in the *News and Courier* of Charleston, published by Mr. Kershaw since the appearance of his article in the REVIEW, in giving the replies of the Clergy of the Diocese to a circular issued by him, he writes that "these replies clearly indicate that fundamentally the Clergy and Laity are not divided, and that they differ only as to the ways and means of accomplishing the mutually desired end" to wit, a separate organisation of the colored people who adhere to our communion.

First, then, let me remind Mr. Kershaw in all kindness, that he has certainly forgotten what took place at the last convention, 1887 when he writes, p. 408-9,

The pamphlet now concludes with a restatement of the matters in issue, as seen by the writers, and an appeal to the laity to *judge for themselves* as to their future course. We only hope that they will do so in the fear of GOD and in the spirit of their LORD. *It certainly would appear strange to any one not cognisant of the facts that in all*

*this discussion, extending now over three years and more (twelve years according to the pamphlet), NOT ONE ATTEMPT has been made by the laity to bring about a conference between their representatives and the Bishop and his clergy that it might be ascertained whether or no an eirenicon might be found.*

It is singular that this has been the precise complaint of the Laity as against the Clergy often expressed. But let that pass. Let us see what the Laity have done.

First, I would refer Mr. Kershaw to Mr. Memminger's letter to the Bishop of September 28, 1881, published as an appendix B to the statement which he is reviewing in which Mr. Memminger submits to the Bishop's consideration a plan "which, without yielding up things essential, might yet afford to the large population in some form the benefits of the administration of our Church." Then if Mr. Kershaw will recollect, on the morning of the meeting of the convention I asked him to second a motion one of us would make to sever the report on the Clergy List, so as to act upon the two different classes of which the Clergy List, as prescribed by the Constitution, is composed, to wit: (1.) those having seats and votes, and (2) those having only seats—explaining to him that our purpose was, by acting at once upon the first class (in which class there were no clergymen about whom there was any question), to organise the Convention immediately and avoid the scandal of a controversy over its organisation—that as the clergyman in question, Mr. Pollard, would this year have but a seat and not a vote, we might leave that part of the report unacted upon as no one would disturb his sitting—that if this was done, our purpose was to introduce a resolution to refer this subject to a commission of three clergymen to be elected by the Clergy, and three laymen to be elected by the laity, which commission should be charged with trying to find some solution of the question. And if Mr. Kershaw will recall the fact, he agreed with me to do so; and when Mr. St. Julien Jervey made on our part the motion to sever, to carry out this purpose, Mr. Kershaw did second it as he had agreed to do.

If in the excitement of the subsequent controversy these facts have escaped his memory, the following extracts from the Journal of the Convention and the report of the proceedings of the Convention published in the *News and Courier* the next morning will show that I am scarcely mistaken.

In the Journal of the Convention, we read at page 19:

Mr. W. St. J. Jervey moved to divide the question on the adoption of the report, so as to take the vote first upon those entitled to all the privileges of the convention. After discussion as to the propriety of this motion, it was withdrawn by the mover. Mr. E. McCrady, Jr., renewed the same motion, which was ruled out of order.

The report of the *News and Courier* is as follows:

Col. McCrady renewed the suggestion, however. He desired, he said, to accomplish something in the way of organising the Convention, and in order to do this he proposed to seat the clergymen and laymen about whom there was no dispute. In this way the Convention would be an organised body, and no longer in that disreputable condition of disorganisation, which was so much to be deprecated. Having brought about this desirable condition of affairs, his side proposed to offer a resolution raising a commission of three clergymen and three laymen, to whom should be referred that portion of the Bishop's address alluding to the colored question, with instructions to report to the next Convention.

The motion to divide the question upon the Report, for the purpose explained, was defeated by the following vote: Clerical: Yeas, 5. Nays, 21. Laymen (Parishes): Yeas, 19. Nays, 9. Divided, 3.

Was this not at least "one attempt" by the Laity to bring about a conference between their representatives and the Bishop and his clergy that it might be ascertained whether or no an eirenicon might be found? And was it not defeated by the clergy themselves?

But let me remind Mr. Kershaw of another matter which has no doubt escaped his recollection. The day after the deputies withdrew from the Convention, that is Saturday, they met in the Sunday School building adjoining S. Philip's Church, where the Convention assembled, and a committee on the part of those remaining was appointed to wait upon and request "their brethren (who had withdrawn) to reconsider their action and resume their seats in the Convention." Mr. Kershaw was one of this committee; and if he will recall the circumstances, I think he will remember that he found the Deputies who had withdrawn in conference with the Rev. Dr. C. C. Pinckney, the Rev. Dr. Robert Wilson and the Rev. E. C. Edgerton. Now, if he will ask anyone of those clergymen, and also the Rev. Ellison Capers,

who had just left us, he will learn from them that they were with us by our invitation, and that we were earnestly seeking some solution of our difficulties. It was the information received from Mr. Kershaw's Committee of the action taken by those who had remained in the Convention that put an end to a conference which, sought by the Laity, might have brought about the reunion of the Deputies, and some action looking to the peace of the Diocese.

It happened that a day or two after the Convention a similar charge to that which Mr. Kershaw now makes came to my ears, with the addition that I had been the obstructionist in the way of peace. This led me to address notes to several of the clergy, with whom I had conversed during the Convention, asking them to state what they happened to know of my personal efforts to promote peace at that time. Their replies so fully vindicate not only myself but those of the Laity who were acting with me, that I trust I may be excused the egotism of making extracts from them.

The Rev. Dr. Pinckney writes me :

I cheerfully comply with your request. At our conference on Saturday morning you exhibited an earnest desire to accommodate the differences which had arisen in the Convention. You seemed ready to return to your place if the way was opened to do so honorably, and the terms of reunion which you proposed were so conciliatory that I was willing to make a motion to that effect as soon as I returned to my seat, and I feel little doubt that they would have proved as satisfactory to the Convention.

The Rev. Ellison Capers, writes :

I need not tell you how I deplore our trouble in Convention. To my mind and conscience I believe that mutual concession is the one way out of our difficulties, and I deeply regret, my dear General, that I did not vote for your proposition to divide the motion to adopt the clergy list so as to allow the laity to agree to an organisation. The clergy, while holding to the view that they were seated canonically, if not unseated individually by a majority, could have allowed this vote on your proposition on the ground you well expressed, and you and your friends could have remained with us. But your second proposition, which Dr. Pinckney and I agreed to support, seemed to me to be a wise concession from you which I had hoped to urge upon the Convention, and if we could have only got it before the body, I feel morally sure a majority of the clergy would have supported it.

The Rev. E. C. Edgerton writes:

Yours of the 17th inst., asking me to state what I happened to know of your personal efforts to secure an adjustment and accommodation of the unfortunate differences in the late Diocesan Convention, has just been received. I do not know for what purpose you make the request, but am free to say that the impression I received was that you sincerely regretted the disagreement that had arisen, and that you were ready to make any concession not involving a matter of principle to restore harmony, much more so than I had expected.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Wilson writes:

In reply to your letter of this date, it affords me great pleasure to state the satisfaction with which I recall your most earnest and self-sacrificing effort to restore harmony in our late sad divisions by offering to yield, if permitted to do so without prejudice, the position which you had taken under a strong and conscientious conviction of duty. I am fully satisfied that had your pacific counsels prevailed, supported as they were by Messrs. Hanckel, Benet and C. E. R. Drayton, the unhappy breach would have been healed.

With the same sincere desire for the peace of the Church, I appeal to the Rev. Mr. Kershaw, and those who agree with him, to reason with us about this matter. Let us not call each other names, which cannot advance argument, but let us study it together.

---

There are one or two minor points which we shall very briefly notice before we discuss those of general interest to the Church at large:

1. Mr. Kershaw has failed entirely to understand our point as to the constitutional representation of the parishes by those who remained in the convention. Page 406-7. We did not claim that if an "election is not found to be the result of the choice of a majority of all the delegates elected to represent the parishes and a majority of the clergy present, it is no election." He has entirely missed our point, which is this: That as under the provisions of our constitution on a vote by Orders, "the clergy shall vote individually and the Lay Deputies by Churches (a majority from each Church having one vote), it requires in each instance, on such a vote, a majority of those elected to represent each Church, and not a mere majority of those present from each Church. We instanced S. Luke's delegation.

From the journal it appeared that *four* delegates had been elected, all of whom took their seats; that *three* withdrew; and the remaining *one* was allowed to cast the vote of his Church. We said that *one* would be a majority of nothing—and we showed that, with a single exception, no parish was represented in those who remained by a majority of those elected. Our point is that on a vote by Orders it requires a majority of those elected by *each* parish to cast the particular vote of that parish. We did not claim that it was necessary to have a majority of all deputies elected in the whole Diocese present. Mr. Kershaw has therefore put himself to unnecessary trouble in preparing the table he presents at page 407.

2. Mr. Kershaw complains of what he terms "the money test." We can only say that the table, which we presented—showing that the deputies who withdrew represented more than half of all the souls in connection with the Church, represented and not represented in the Convention, and more than two-thirds of those who were represented in the Convention, and that we represented parishes which paid more than two-thirds of all the contributions to parochial work, and more than two-thirds of all Diocesan and parochial combined, and nearly four times as much as those represented by the deputies who remained—was simply in answer to the charge which had been made that after all those of us who withdrew represented very few in the Diocese.

3. We quoted the resolutions of the Standing Committee, under which the testimonials in the Saltus case were signed by all the Committee, and which resolutions were reported to the Convention and are to be found in the journal of 1881, as declaring "that it would reverse the order of missionary operations, and even of nature itself, and would tend to the advantage of neither race, that the race having the lesser Christian knowledge and culture should be advanced to the position of teachers and rulers over the other race," and that for the present at least "it is not expedient to invest individuals of the less advanced race with official authority over the other race;" but also declaring that "the case now presented to the Committee is exceptional in so many particulars, that when it is understood to be the intention of the applicant to confine the ministration of his office to S. Mark's and similar congregations, the objections to his admission may be considered as sufficiently

obviated to allow his testimonials to be signed by the whole Committee." Mr. Kershaw says [page 389] it is manifest that if what these resolutions stated as to the condition of the colored race and their relation was *true*, no colored man, however "exceptional" his case might have been, should have been allowed to pass the Committee as a candidate for Orders. I agree with Mr. Kershaw in this, and I have no doubt that the gentlemen whom he names and on whom he now seeks to throw the responsibility of the action also agree with him, and regret that they yielded their well-known opinions to this exceptional case. But it must be remembered that the other members of the Committee, who made that report, were the Rev. Dr. C. C. Pinckney, Rev. John Johnson, Rev. A. T. Porter, D. D., Rev. J. E. Jackson, Messrs W. A. Pringle, H. D. Lesesne, and Dr. W. T. Wragg. Surely then, even if the Rev. Mr. Campbell and Messrs. McCrady and Memminger are worthy of censure because of their opinions and course in this matter, the others of the Committee named are sufficient guarantee of the good faith of the Resolutions which Mr. Kershaw's language—no doubt unintentional—would seem almost to question.

The Saltus case was indeed treated as an exception, and, furthermore, it is well known that, on the part of at least some of the Committee, it was understood that the precedents of the Standing Committee of New York, under Bishop Hobart, and of Pennsylvania, under Bishop White, in the case of Absalom Jones, would be followed and that Mr. Saltus would not claim a seat in the Convention. Mr. Kershaw meets these instances, in which colored clergymen were not allowed seats in Conventions, with the remark that "after all their doings of long ago are no guides for us" (p. 403.). But in this he forgets his position, to wit: the inherent right of all Clergymen to seats in Convention *ex officio*. Now, surely if this right be inherent, it must have been *semper eadem*, and if we show that "long ago" Clergymen had no such *ex officio* rights, and were excluded because of their color, we have refuted his argument of inherent rights.

Most singularly Mr. Kershaw arraigns the Rev. Mr. Campbell and Messrs. McCrady and Memminger for recommending another colored applicant for the Ministry, to wit: Quarles—and yet, strange to say, the Bishop in his address had arraigned

these very gentlemen, not by name, but as was understood by all, for *refusing to recommend* this very applicant, and distinctly charged them with having so refused because of his color. "I believe," he said, "the candidate was refused by the Committee because of African descent."

And as I have had thus to allude to this reproof of the Bishop to the Standing Committee on this occasion, I must, as a Layman, with all deference and reverence, solemnly, but most earnestly, protest against the right of the Bishop thus to arraign the Committee because they refused to recommend an applicant for the Ministry. The Standing Committee of the Diocese is a co-ordinate, and in their sphere of action, independent branch of the Church Government under our Constitution General and Diocesan. They are not amenable to the official criticism or censure of the Bishop in the discharge of their duty. They are provided and elected for the special reason that they are supposed to be the better judges of the qualifications of an applicant for Holy Orders than the Bishop himself, and he has no right *officially* to question, still less to arraign, the members for their action in any given case.

---

The three questions which we propose to discuss more fully are:

1. As to the Bishop's power, as presiding officer in Convention, on questions of Order.
2. As to the nature of the right of clergymen to seats in a Convention.
3. Has there ever been a Christian Church founded on other than Race lines?

1. *As to the Bishop's Power as Presiding Officer in Convention on Questions of Order.*

As we stated in the paper which Mr. Kershaw reviews, we were no seceders from the *Church* but we withdrew from the *Convention*. (1.) Because the Bishop as the presiding officer, having put to the body the question of confirming the report upon the list of clerical members, and announcing that the report was not confirmed by the vote taken, assumed as of right to decide that the Convention was nevertheless organised for business; and (2.) because upon an appeal from this ruling he, having put the question: "*Shall the decision of the chair stand*

as the judgment of this house?" and upon the vote taken thereon himself having announced that the decision of the chair was *not* sustained, nevertheless insisted that the Convention *was* organised for business; and (3.) because from this latter ruling he would allow no appeal.

To enable those not familiar with the facts to understand our position, I would state that—while the canon relating to the organisation of the Convention (Canon VIII.) provides that two Committees on Credentials shall be appointed, the first consisting of three clergymen to whom the roll of the clergy shall be referred—the second of three Laymen to whom shall be referred the roll of lay deputies, and that these Committees shall examine forthwith and report to the Convention upon the lists so referred—no action had been taken upon the clergy list prior to the organisation of the Convention for several years until 1885, when, this question arising, the laity insisted that the Convention was not fully organised until the clergy list had been acted upon. In that year, when a motion was made by a Layman to adopt the Report of the Committee on the Clergy list, the Bishop ruled the motion out of order. In the Convention of 1886, the question was again made that the Convention could not proceed to business until their report had been acted upon, and the Bishop ruling in the same way an appeal was taken. The Bishop then thus put the question to the Convention:

The house was confined entirely to the question of the adoption or rejection of the Report of the Committee on the Clerical List. On that Committee's Report a motion was made to adopt it. The chair ruled such adoption out of order. Thereupon an appeal was taken. The appeal has been discussed and the question is about to be put. The real question, however, is not shall the appeal be sustained, but shall the decision of the chair stand as the decision of the Convention? —*News and Courier*.

The vote on this appeal was taken by Orders, and resulted as follows: Clergy—Yeas, 25, Nays, 4. Parishes—Yeas, 5, Nays, 25. Divided, 1. The Bishop recognised the legal effect of this vote as binding upon the chair. He stated that he had taken advice from the highest parliamentary authority, and that this advice was that upon an appeal from the decision of the chair a divided vote was equivalent to a reversal of the

chair's decision inasmuch as it requires an affirmative vote to sustain the chair's decision. It is, we believe, an open secret that this advice was not only that of the highest parliamentary authority in this State but also that of the highest in this country. At any rate it was sufficient, as the Bishop stated, to be conclusive upon him, and he then recognised it as such and acted upon it.

In 1887, the Convention, by a divided vote, having refused to confirm the report of the Clerical List, the Bishop ruled that the Convention was nevertheless organised for business. From this ruling an appeal was again made. This year instead of following the course he had pursued the year before, the Bishop announced that he would put this appeal but would receive no further appeals. He then put the appeal in the formula which he had stated the year before he had been advised was the proper one, to wit: "*Shall the decision of the chair stand as the sense of the House?*" Upon this, as the year before, the Clergy and Laity again divided, whereupon the Bishop announced that "*there being a non-concurrence, the decision of the chair had not been sustained*"—but immediately turned to the Secretary and instructed him to proceed with the business.

Now, then, as we asked in the statement which Mr. Kershaw criticises, we again ask in all soberness, why did the Bishop go through the meaningless form of putting the question to the House "*whether his decision should stand,*" if he had not intended to be bound by the result? If he was bound by the vote of the Convention in 1886 upon an appeal from his decision, was he not likewise bound in 1887?

Another appeal was attempted to be taken, but, as the Bishop announced he would do, he refused to put the appeal to the House. Had the Bishop the right to refuse to put an appeal? He certainly did not think that he had in 1885 or in 1886. Indeed, in 1887 he admitted the right of appeal, for he put one though he refused to be bound by its result. But had he the right to refuse?

Bishop Randall, in his work entitled "*Why am I a Churchman?*" [p. 82], says, the government of the Church is purely republican and giving a brief outline of its practical operation and the organisation of the Diocesan Conventions, he states "*The Bishop presides but has no other voice than that of a presiding officer.*" \*

\* See, also, *The Genius and Mission of the Church in the United States*—Dr. Colton.

But Judge Hoffman, who with Mr. Kershaw we recognise as an authority upon Canon Law, though we cannot always concur with his extreme views of Episcopal prerogative, in contending for the inherent right of Bishops to preside at our Conventions, expressly says that the right, which existed in former ages of a full negative upon the act of any Diocesan synod or council, has been by the Bishops of our Church in almost all the Dioceses renounced. He says that in the larger number of the Dioceses the power of the Bishop as presiding officer upon questions of order has been specially regulated, and at page 304 mentions South Carolina among those Dioceses in which the right of appeal on questions of order from the Bishop to the Convention is recognised. Indeed, he gives the instance, in which in the Convention of 1844, the Bishop of South Carolina refusing to receive certain resolutions offered in the House, the question of reception was demanded on an appeal and was carried in the affirmative. The Bishop, who was the venerable Bishop Gadsden, it is true refused even to be present when the resolution (which touched upon the Onderdonk controversy) was considered, but he did not refuse to allow it to be put after the vote of the Convention, but calling the President of the Standing Committee to the chair he desired to be considered absent.

We submit then we had the right to our appeal, and to the observance of the result of the vote upon it, and were justified in withdrawing from the Convention when the Bishop refused to regard the result of the vote taken on the appeal put by him, and to allow any other appeal.

2. *"As to the Nature of the Right of Clergymen to Seats in a Convention."*

Mr. Kershaw takes issue with the statement of the Pamphlet wherein it is said :

We venture to assert that no instance in the history of the Church can be found in which clergymen have had seats in any *legislative* synod or council by virtue simply of their orders.

He says, p. 392 :

What is meant by "*legislative* synod or councils" is not clear, nor is it defined anywhere by the writers of the pamphlet : but to go no further back than the South Carolina Diocesan Constitution

of 1807, as it is published in Dalcho, pp. 602, *et seq.* Rule 3 says: 'The minister or ministers of every Church which shall accede to these rules shall always be *ex officio* a member or members of the Convention.'

True, he says, the rule goes on to restrict the right to vote under certain circumstances; but that is not the point. The point is as to the clergyman's right to be *ex officio* a member of the Diocesan Council. That right is here recognised and continued to be for many years.

The fallacy of this argument is manifest. It lies in the use of the word "recognised." This right, restricted as it was, was not *recognised*. It was *conferred* by that constitution. This will appear on a moment's reflection. To "recognise" is to avow or confess knowledge of (Richardson) something already existing. To have been recognised, therefore, this right—such as it was—must have existed *before* the Constitution of 1807. But this was notoriously *not* the case. Previous to the Constitution of 1807, the fourteen Conventions, which had met, including the fifteenth, which adopted this Constitution, were Conventions of "*deputies*."

The *first*, that of May 1785, was a meeting of "gentlemen \* \* \* duly authorized \* \* \* to represent the Vestries of their respective Churches," [*Dalcho, Church of South Carolina, p. 465*]. The journal of the *second* (July 1785) commences: "*At a meeting of the following Deputies from the Vestries of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of South Carolina, held at Charleston:*" and among these Deputies were "S. Philip's—The Rev. Robert Smith \* \* \* S. Michael's—The Rev. Henry Purcell \* \* \* S. James', Goose Creek—The Rev. Mr. Ellington \* \* \* " This Convention was presided over by a layman, Hugh Rulledge, Esq. [*Dalcho, p. 466*]. The entries of the journal of the *third* Convention (April 1786) are similar, and over this Convention the Rev. Robert Smith was *elected* to preside. The entries of the journals of the *fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh* Conventions are similar. That of the *eighth* Convention (1790) is in these words: *Agreeably to notice given in the Gazettes, for the respective Vestries of the Pro. Epis. Churches, to meet at S. Philip's Church, this day, the following Deputies appeared: S. Philip's—Rev. Dr. Smith, the Rev. Thomas Frost \* \* \* S. Michael's—Rev. Dr. Purcell \* \* \* S. James', Goose*

*Creek, Rev. Dr. Ellington \* \* \** etc. So the entries continue, even after the election and consecration of the first Bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, who, in at least two Conventions after he was Bishop, appeared and sat as a deputy from S. Philip's. The entry in the journal of the Fourteenth Convention [October 1796] is as follows [*Dalcho, Church of South Carolina, p. 482.*]:

At a meeting of the following *Deputies* from the Pro. Epis. Churches, in the State held this day; S. Philip's—Bishop Smith, Thomas Radcliffe, John Teasdale. S. Michael's—Dr. Purcell, Col. John Huget, etc. S. Thomas'—The Rev. Mr. Thompson, Mr. Bryan, and so on.

Bishop Smith sat in the Conventions of 1796, 1797 and 1798, as a *deputy* from S. Philip's. There was no Convention again from 1798 to 1804. Bishop Smith died in 1801. The Conventions of 1804, 1805 and 1806 were "*meetings of the Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of South Carolina,*" and the clergymen took their seats as *deputies* from their respective Parishes.

It is clear therefore that the right of the clergy to sit *ex officio* did not exist before the Constitution of 1807, and so was not "recognised," but *conferred* by that Constitution.

Mr. Kershaw would dismiss all this history of the origin and organisation of our Convention with the exclamation: "Here we have the S. Philip's idea of the rights and privileges of the clergy!" But the idea even of a Bishop sitting in a council of the Church as a *deputy* or *delegate* is many centuries older than S. Philip's Church. Indeed it is the original idea of the earliest councils.

Let us quote from *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. 1., p. 131*:

III. These councils of which we find not the smallest trace before the middle of this (2d) century changed the whole face of the Church and gave it a new form; for by them the ancient privileges of the people were considerably diminished and the power and authority of the Bishops greatly augmented. The humility indeed and prudence of these pious prelates prevented their assuming all at once the power with which they were afterwards invested. *At their first appearance in these councils they acknowledged that they were no more than the delegates of their respective churches, and that they acted in the name and by the appointment of their people.*

Again we read in the *History of the Eastern Church by Stanley*, page 158, in treating of the Deliberative characters of the Earlier Councils :

And they are also the first precedents of the principle of representative government. The Nicene Council, like those which followed, and (with the exception of that recorded in the Acts of the Apostles) like those which preceded, consisted chiefly, if not exclusively, of bishops. *But the bishops at that time were literally the representatives of the Christian communities over which they presided.* They were elected by universal suffrage, and they considered themselves responsible to their constituents, to a degree which at times reminds us, even painfully, of the vices of modern constitutional government.

Bishop Smith then did not derogate from his high and holy office when he sat in the council of his Church as a *deputy* from S. Philip's, nor was it congregational in that Church to provide that her minister or ministers should represent her in the Diocesan Conventions.

But let us see *what* right was *conferred* by this Constitution of 1807? Did this Constitution provide that *all* clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this Diocese shall be *ex officio* members of the Convention? Not at all. Mr. Kershaw says: "The point is as to the clergyman's right to be *ex officio* a member of the convention." "That right," he says, "is here recognised." But it will be observed this constitution does not use the term "clergyman" at all. Its provision is: "The *Minister or Ministers* of every Church which shall accede to these rules shall always be *ex officio* a member or members of the Convention." The term "minister" is more restrictive than the term "clergyman." It implies one who ministers or serves. The person then who shall be *ex officio* a member of the Convention is one who serves or ministers in a church which should accede to that constitution. There were two other qualifications for this *ex officio* membership of the Convention, besides that of being a clergyman.

(1.) He must be a clergyman *who ministers or serves in a church.* But that is not all. (2.) He must minister or serve in a church *which shall have acceded to this Constitution.* The Constitution of 1807 did not then either *recognise* or *confer* the right of *clergymen* to seats in the Convention. It *conferred* the right only upon certain specified clergymen, as it *conferred*

the right upon certain specified layman, to wit: those chosen as it prescribed.

Mr. Kershaw says: "True the rule goes on to restrict the right to vote under certain circumstances, but that is not the point." We submit that *that is exactly the point*. The full text of the rule is as follows:

Rule III. The Minister or Ministers of every Church, who shall accede to these rules, shall always be, *ex officio*, a Member or Members of the Convention, with a right to vote on all matters requiring the suffrages thereof, so as they do not involve the temporal concerns of the Churches; but this right to vote on matters which do involve the temporal concerns of the Churches shall, nevertheless, appertain to such clerical member or members, provided a certificate be produced by him or them to the Convention, on its annual or other meetings, signed by a majority of the vestry of a Church, or other authority of a congregation, with which he or they may be connected, expressive of such their wish or assent, and that he or they shall in their behalf exercise such right in the absence of their Lay Delegate or Delegates.

Mr. Kershaw appeals to this Rule III. of 1807 as the recognition of the *ex officio* right of clergymen to seats in the Convention, and he denounces the By-Law of S. Philip's Church, which regulates the election of delegates to the Convention; and yet this By-Law of S. Philip's but recites the Rule of the Constitution of 1807 *ipsissimis verbis*, and adds to it the further provision that no minister or ministers of the Church shall be competent to represent the same, save in connection with two or more lay delegates.

This by-law may be very monstrous—it may deserve all the censure Mr. Kershaw heaps upon it—it may contain the now damning doctrine of nullification—but it is a consolation to the present congregation, who have lived under it, that many saintly and learned men, clergy and laity, have not, in eighty years, found it burdensome upon their conscience to represent the mother church under its provisions. Two, at least, have been called from the pew in which they sat as representatives of S. Philip's under this very rule, to be bishops of the Diocese. Our present Bishop was content to be a representative from S. Philip's, under this rule for many years; and our present honored Rector for seventeen years has sat without reproach under its provisions. Indeed, it stands there a monumental refuta-

tion of the idea of this *recognised* and inherent right of clergymen to seats in the Convention of this Diocese.

Mr. Kershaw quotes Judge Hoffman's opinion that the principle of the early Church was that its *ministers*, as such, form part of the synodical council, as if Judge Hoffman asserted the right of a clergyman to be *ex officio* a member of a Diocesan convention. If he so construes Judge Hoffman, we are sure he is entirely mistaken. So far from it, Judge Hoffman, treating of the Bishop's lists, says, p. 196:

When a Bishop becomes a party to a compact, by which a convention shall be formed to be composed of clergymen, and in which the qualifications of those to be admitted as members are stated, that assent involves an assent that the convention shall judge of the possessions of these qualifications. There must be a positive enactment to avoid this consequence. \* \* \* the Bishop agrees to the establishment and composition of a body to which presumptively the privilege attaches of deciding upon its members' qualifications. There should be an express denial of the powers or an express bestowal of it elsewhere to avoid this conclusion.

As we recalled in our statement, but ten years ago this very matter was again fully discussed in the Convention of Massachusetts, and though the effort to *establish* the right of clergymen *ex officio* to seats in the convention of that Diocese was made by such able advocates as Dr. Vinton and Dr. Burgess, it was defeated by a majority even of the clergy themselves. But Dr. Vinton and Dr. Burgess sought to *establish* that right, it was not claimed that such right *existed*.

Mr. Kershaw, in further replying to the statement of the Pamphlet, wherein the writers "venture to assert that no instance, in the history of the Church can be found in which clergymen have had seats in any *legislative* synod or council by virtue simply of their orders," (1) complains that what is meant by *legislative* synod or council, is not clear, nor is it defined anywhere by the writers, and then, (2) meets the challenge with a counter challenge. He says:

No record of any council ever held can be adduced in which the clergy were not present in and by virtue of their orders. The proof to the contrary is challenged. Assertion is not proof.

Surely not. But Mr. Kershaw forgets that he has the affirmative of this question to maintain. He is asserting that clergy-

men have an inherent or *ex officio* right to such seats; and by all rules of logic the burden is on him to establish his assertion by precedent or authority. But we will accept the change of position, and will point at once two instances of authority—at least to the Church in this country—in which clergymen do not sit by virtue of their orders.

Before we do so, however, let us explain what we meant by using the restrictive term "*legislative synod or council*"; and why we restricted our challenge to the production of an instance in which clergymen sat in *such* synods or councils by virtue of their orders.

In doing this, we had in mind the distinction which we supposed was familiar to the clergy between Diocesan and the higher Synods of old. For this distinction we would refer Mr. Kershaw to the article on "*Council*" in IX. Ed: *Encyclopedia Britannica*, by D. Patrick.

At the Diocesan synods, presbyters were members as well as the bishops, but they had only a *vetum consultativum*. The regular members of the higher synods were the bishops alone or their representatives, and exercised the *vetum decisivum*. But other clergy, Deacons, Doctors of Theology and of Canon Law, were invited to assist the bishop with their advice, and it seems *sometimes* at least the Abbots were *permitted* to give a decisive vote.

To come then to the production of instances of synods or councils, in which clergymen were not present in and by virtue of their Order, we have to go no further for one than the many Conventions of this Diocese which sat under the Constitution of 1807, quoted by Mr. Kershaw. For it is manifest that the clergymen who sat in the Conventions under that Constitution, acknowledging its restrictions, sat there by virtue of its provisions and not by virtue of their Orders. If clergymen had a right *inherent* in their orders to sit in conventions, then *all* clergymen in the Diocese had such right, independently of that Constitution, and the Constitution could not deprive them of it. But under that Constitution only certain of the clergy could enjoy this right, to wit; the minister or ministers of such Churches—and such Churches only—as acceded to its provisions. The clergymen, therefore, who for many years sat under that Constitution, furnish at least, one instance in which the clergy were not present by virtue of their Order.

But again, whatever rights are to be claimed by clergymen or members of the Church in this country, as inherent in their orders or membership, independent of our Constitution, Diocesan and General, they must show that such right likewise appertained to those of the mother Church of England. As Dr. Vinton, in his *Manual on Canon Law* [p. 15], teaches, the identity of the Church of England with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States consists—in one particular—"in that the discipline of the Church of England—including Laws and Canons for rule and government, as far (and in every particular as far) as it was not necessarily, or by express enactment, changed was continued and perpetuated." Or as Judge Hoffman expresses it, no violent disruption of the sacred bond took place between the Church in England and that in this country. The daughter glided from the mother's side, because in the allotment of Providence she had been led to maturity and independence, but the spiritual union, the union of faith, of worship, and of discipline, was undestroyed. [*Law of the Church* p. 30.]

Doubtless, we, both of clergy and laity, have rights in the Church in this country not enjoyed in England, but these we owe to our peculiar government and organisation, as the same have been by Constitutions and Canons expressly conferred. What we claim as inherent in our orders or membership, we must show to be derived from the common law of the mother Church—from ancient recognised right—and not from our recent paper Constitution.

Let us remember then that there were no such things in England as our Diocesan and General Conventions. It is true that the Bishop of every Diocese had anciently in England, as in all other Christian countries, power to convene the clergy of his Diocese, and in common synod or council with them to transact such affairs as related to the order and government of the churches under his jurisdiction, [*Burn's Ecclesiastical Law Convocation*, p. 15.] But, as we have already had occasion to observe, the clergy met with the Bishop to consult with him not to decide or legislate. What the Bishop of every Diocese did within his own district, the archbishop of each province, after the kingdom was divided into provinces, did within his proper province. They called together first the Bishops, afterwards the other prelates of their provinces, and

we are told "by degrees added to these *such of their inferior clergy as they thought needful.*"

But in these assemblies of the clergy (the Diocesan synod and the Provincial councils) only the spiritual affairs of the Church were wont to be transacted. Says Burns, citing White Kennet, Bishop of Peterborough, 1718, on Ecclesiastical Synods or Parliamentary convocations in the Church of England :

Even so, in Saxon times, if the subjects of any laws was for the outward peace and temporal government of the Church, such laws were properly ordained by the king and the *great council of clergy and laity intervened* as our acts of Parliament are still made. But if there was any doctrine to be tried, or any exercise of pure discipline to be reformed, then the clergy of the great council departed into a separate synod and there acted as the proper judges. (Ibid.)

Here, by the way, is a complete refutation of Mr. Kershaw's idea that Laymen, as an order, had no right in Convention, i. e. synods or councils, until one hundred and three years ago, when the General Convention of the Church *gave* them the right [p. 392]. And if any further authority is needed, we would refer to the Council of Nicea, in which a large number, perhaps the majority, consisted of rough, simple, almost illiterate men, shepherds and hermits, who held their faith earnestly and sincerely, but without conscious grounds on which they maintained them, and of which a story is told that it was a simple minded layman, whose sightless eye or limping leg, bearing witness of his zeal for Christian Faith, by a happy exclamation calmed the controversy when disputation was running high. *History of the Eastern Church* (Stanley) p. 204. And even if this story is untrue, its tradition proves conclusively that laymen were present at that first (excluding that of Jerusalem) council. But why argue about the presence of laymen at the earlier councils, when, according to the only precedents universally recognised, an Œcumenical council could not be summoned except by an Emperor. Indeed, as the author we have just quoted says, the idea of the well known words of the articles of the Church of England, to wit; "General Councils may not be gathered together but by the commandment and will of Princes," was almost implied in the meaning of the term applied to them. "An 'Œcumenical Synod,' that is, an 'Imperial gathering' from the whole *οἰκουμένη*, or Empire (for this was the technical

meaning of the word, even in the Greek of the New Testament) could be convened only by the Emperor." [*Ibid*, p. 159.] As an instance of the use of the word in this sense, he refers to Chapt. ii. v. 1, *S. Luke*:

And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world (*οικουμένη*) should be taxed.

But to return. The convocations of Canterbury and York are the only ecclesiastical bodies retaining even a shadow of legislative function in England to-day, and even these, were in abeyance at the Revolution, the time of the separation of ours from the mother Church—they not having met from 1741 to 1853. Did we inherit any rights which were dormant at the time of our separation?

But what right of representation did the clergy and laity ever possess in these convocations? The laity had in Convocation none at all. They exercised their control in Parliament; and in Parliament the laymen absolutely controlled the English Church. But what about the right of the clergy to representation in these bodies? These convocations were composed of the Archbishops, their suffragans, the deans, archdeacons, the proctor for the chapter and two proctors for the clergy. So then not *all* the clergy were entitled to seats in these convocations, as they must have been, had there been an inherent right in their office to such seats. But not only so, for the two proctors allowed for the clergy were by no means intended to represent all the clergy. They were there to represent only some of the clergy. Only some of the clergy could vote for these proctors to represent them. We read in *Burn's Ecclesiastical Law* [Convocation, p. 24].

6. Only parsons, vicars and perpetual curates are capable of giving their votes in choosing proctors for the Diocesan clergy.

Who then were the "parsons," "vicars and "perpetual curates," who then elected the proctors to represent them? A parson, *personæ ecclesiæ*, was one that had full possession of the rights of a parochial Church, one who had for life the freehold in himself of the parsonage house, the glebe, the tithes and other dues. A vicar, *vicarius*, was one who had a living under the parson, called a vicarage, that is part or portion of the parsonage. A perpetual curate was one, who, unlike the ordinary

curate, had a fixed estate in his curacy, one who was not removable by the Bishop. [See *Blackstone—Jacob's Law Dictionary—Burn's Eccl. Law.*] The right to vote for proctors or representatives, it is then seen was not a right common to *all* the clergy, as it would have been had it been inherent in their orders; but it depended on the nature of the estate or property they had in the benefices, or appointments. This will be understood when we recollect that before the time of Edward the First, only the bishops and some other prelates as abbots and parsons had been brought into the great councils of the realm, where they acted and consulted together with the laity in Parliament. But the clergy, increasing in numbers and wealth with their valuable foundations and holdings, bore no part in the public burdens. They were exempt from taxation. It was to get at their revenues that Edward determined to have the clergy as a third estate to the Lords and Commons. His project was that as the two temporal estates charged the temporalities and made laws to bind all temporal things within the realm, so the clergy should constitute a body to change the spiritual possessions and to make canons to bind the ecclesiastical body. But this body, instead of becoming a third estate as the King designed became an ecclesiastical parliament to make laws and tax the possessions of the Church. [*Burn's Ecclesiastical Law.*] But Henry the VIII. put a stop to these ecclesiastical parliaments. He prohibited the convocation from making any provincial canons, constitutions and ordinances, without the royal license. (*Ibid.*)

It is thus seen that the purpose, for which Edward the First summoned the inferior clergy to convocation, left a permanent stamp upon the character of those he allowed to sit, and who sat there after him. As his purpose was taxation, he summoned only those who had something to be taxed. Hence, it is, that to this day only the clergy, who have a legal estate in the property of offices or appointments, are allowed to vote for proctors to represent them. As Sir Travers Twiss, Q. C., the well known ecclesiastical lawyer in England, in his article on convocation, *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ninth Ed., tells us "the convocations of the two provinces have always comprised a *definite* number of the *beneficed* clergy of the several Dioceses," i. e. of the clergy who have ecclesiastical livings—preferments in the Church of England rectories, vicarages, or perpetual curacies, etc.

It is thus seen that the clergy, who are represented in the only *quasi* legislative body in England, are represented there by virtue of the legal estate or property they have in their offices or appointments, and not by virtue of the holy function of their Orders. As the clergy in this country, therefore, derive and can claim no inherent right greater than those of the mother Church, they can claim no such inherent right to sit and legislate in our councils by reason of their Orders. Like the laity, they must find their right in the Constitution of our Church.

3. *Mr. Kershaw asks : Has there ever been a Christian Church founded on race lines ? If so, when, where, by whom ?* [p. 402.]

We might, with some propriety, here adopt Mr. Kershaw's own method of arguments and reply by asking : Has there ever been a Christian Church founded on *other* than race lines ? If so, when, where, by whom ?

But we again readily assume the burden of the proof. In the outset, however, we acknowledge that Mr. Kershaw has caught us in a slip as to the parting asunder of Paul and Barnabas, and he is free to make as much of it as he likes. But, all the same, the question of race had been raised even before Paul and Barnabas separated, and they had differed upon it, "inso-much that Barnabas also was carried away (against Paul) with other dissimulations," *Galatians* ii. 12. It was the question before the assembly at Jerusalem, in which assembly all Christian parties have, with one consent, sought the prototype of all Christian councils ; but from the scanty records of which it is manifest that neither CHRIST nor the apostles intended to prescribe any synodal form or system for the infant Church. The question before the council of Jerusalem was whether the Jewish rite, the Mosaic ceremonial, should be forced upon the Gentile converts. It was as to the enforcement of a peculiarly national, or race, religious custom, and this was settled upon a practical compromise, an arrangement of a *modus vivendi* in the spirit of peace and mutual forbearance. Let us trust that the spirit of James' opinion or advice—not his sentence or adjudgment as is sometimes conceived—may be followed by us all, clergy and laity, and some common ground for peace be found for us as it was in that first council at Jerusalem.

To whom was the Revelation made ? Was it to the Church

in the world at large? Was it not rather to distinct national Churches? Listen to S. John :

What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven Churches which are in Asia ; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

And again, chap. ii. :

(V. 1.) Unto the angel (*i. e.*, bishop) of the Church of Ephesus write :

(V. 8.) And unto the angel of the Church in Smyrna write :

(V. 12.) And to the angel of the Church in Pergamos write :

(V. 8.) And unto the angel of the Church in Thyatira write :

(Chap. iii., v. 1.) And unto the angel of the Church in Sardis write :

(V. 7.) And to the angel of the Church in Philadelphia write :

(V. 14.) And unto the angel of the Church of the Laodiceans write :

To each of these separate race or national churches is a separate message sent, as to what is distinctively commended or found wanting in them.

So too the epistles of Paul are first "to all who be in Rome beloved of GOD, called to be saints"; then "unto the Church of GOD which is at Corinth"; then unto the churches of Galatia; then unto the Saints which are in Ephesus; then to all the Saints in CHRIST JESUS, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons; then to the Colossians; then unto the Church of the Thessalonians; then to the Hebrews. James writes to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad. Peter to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. The epistle of S. John was probably addressed to the church of Ephesus; and that of S. Luke to the Jews. Observe the distinction made by S. Paul and S. Peter. S. Paul writes to the *churches* of Galatia, S. Peter to the *strangers* in Galatia.

The three great divisions of the Church to-day are the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglo-Saxon. It is true it has ever been the policy of Rome to efface national distinctions. But this policy has not led the Latin Church to assimilate itself with the various people over whom she has ruled, but rather to impress the stamp of her nationality upon every such people. The six Cardinal Bishops are the Bishops of the Sees, lying immediately

around Rome, while the fifty cardinal priests take their titles from the principal churches in Rome. Before Cardinal Gibbon could put on his scarlet hat, he had to go to Rome to take charge of a See there. The daily and weekly papers of the country told of the proceedings and the illustrated journals were full of the ceremonial, depicting the newly-appointed cardinal receiving the key of his cathedral. Few appreciated its significance or recognised its full meaning—the submission of an American citizen—the head of a great religious body of our people to a foreign allegiance; allegiance to the head of the Holy *Roman* Catholic church. For the Church of Rome is Roman first, and then Catholic, “Roman in its centre and Catholic in its circumference” is its claim.

Under the shadow of the Greek church national churches have grown and flourished as such. Each patriarch is within his Diocese and over his people what the Galatian theory makes the Pope in the universal church. So, too, the Church of England is essentially the Church of the Anglo-Saxon race. She sends her missions to the four quarters of the globe, and her grand ritual is heard wherever her drum is beat; but it is in the name of the Church of England she preaches CHRIST. Ours, a branch of the Church of England, has up to this time been like her, a Church of the Anglo-Saxon race.

The common names of the old churches in the City of Charleston, indicate how general was the popular idea of the nationality of churches. S. Philips was the distinctive name of the first church built in the city, now more than two hundred years old, but it was scarcely known by that name, which indeed, would probably have been lost, had it not been preserved in the record of a deed of an adjoining lot. It was known as the English Church, *Dalcho's Church of South Carolina*, p. 27. Then the Presbyterian was known as the Scotch Church, the Huguenot as the French Church, and later there were the English Lutheran and the German Lutheran churches.

The truth is, that until the present experiment in this country there never has been in State or Church a government which was not the government, secular or sacred, of a nation or race of a homogeneous people. And even here there are indications that the race or national instinct will assert itself in other parts of the country and by people not concerned in the negro question. Witness the recent movement among the

Roman Catholic Germans in the West to separate their organisation from that of the Irish.

How, indeed, did this very question, which now disturbs our Diocese, originate? Was it not by the action of the colored people themselves following their own race instinct? Surely it was so. The facts, which are not generally known, are these: Prior to the War many of the free colored people of Charleston owned pews in the Episcopal Churches—some pews in the gallery in S. Philip's are still owned by colored people. For all of them were seats provided. But immediately upon the close of the War these people, with few exceptions, withdrew from the old churches, where they and their families had worshipped for generations with the white people, and organised a separate, that is, a *race* church, S. Mark's. And it is this *race* church, claiming representation as such, which gave rise to all this controversy. We do not wish to make any false argument or to leave any false impression. We admit, therefore, in advance, that had these people remained in their old seats they could not and would not have had votes or representation in the white congregation; and that had they so remained and had they claimed votes or representation the question would have arisen in that way. But the point we wish to make and emphasise is that the separation of the races in this instance was, in fact, made by the colored people themselves following their own race instincts. The demand for admission into our Convention is the demand for a *race* representation. This instinct is well expressed in the concluding sentence of an editorial notice in a recent number of *The Churchman* on the report of the Rev. C. B. Perry, of Baltimore, on "*The Supply and Preparation of Colored Men for the Ministry.*" Approving Mr. Perry's suggestions as to the necessity for special schools for colored people exclusively, the notice thus concludes:

We accept those reasons as having weight, but they are as nothing in comparison with the *race feeling*, natural, universal, ineradicable, not necessarily connected with any feeling of hostility to another race which demands that separate schools for their own people be given them.

No reason can be advanced for separate schools which do not apply with equal force to separate organisations for the colored people in our Church Councils and convocations.

December, 1887.

EDWARD MCCRADY, JR.

## Proportional Representation

### In the House of Deputies of the General Convention.

**B**EHIND all the burning questions of our Church, the change of Name, the revisal of the Liturgy, the missionary organisation and the appellate courts stands the fundamental question whether the legislation upon these and other subjects is to result from the will of the great body of the Church, or at least of the majority of her members, or from the will of the minority in direct opposition to the majority; whether this Church is to break from the principles of what all Americans consider true and righteous government, or whether her legislators are to be guided by the same principles of government as are found in their state and national councils; whether this Church is willing to continue the steadily increasing strain of an abnormal constitution and to meet the catastrophe which the far-seeing Bishop White anticipated in writing about the proposed division of the Diocese of New York, in 1835: "When the Constitution was framed, the public mind had not yet raised itself above that excessive attachment to the peculiarities of the different states which is in the way of consistent adherence in practice to the principles contended for in theory, the founding of law on public will. If there should ever happen a dissolution of the unity of our American Church, the deplorable event will probably be occasioned by the said inequality. There may occur questions having important bearings on our worship. Measures may be adopted by a majority, according to the Constitution, but dissented from by an acknowledged majority of our episcopal population. It can hardly be supposed, and is contrary to our observation of human nature, that the measures would be submitted to." [Memoirs p. 465.]

The first question is, therefore, does the present constitution and organisation of the lower House in the General Convention reveal any injustice or point to the danger line in the early future?

A few figures will help us to an answer.

I use the statistics given by the Committee on the State of the Church at the General Convention of 1886.

I first recall parts of Art. 2. of the Constitution. The representation from each Diocese "shall consist of not more than four Clergymen and four Laymen." "And in all questions when required by the Clerical or Lay representation from any Diocese, each Order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by Dioceses shall be conclusive in each Order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the Dioceses represented in that Order. The concurrence of both Orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the House of Deputies." If the other seven Deputies from a Diocese are absent, one Deputy can represent the Diocese. Out of 49 Dioceses, 25 is a majority.

Twenty-five Dioceses as follows :

Alabama .....	4216
Arkansas .....	1364
California.....	4892
Delaware.....	2363
East Carolina.....	2532
Easton.....	2727
Florida.....	2390
Fon du Lac .....	2592
Georgia.....	4822
Maryland .....	4812
Iowa.....	5004
Kansas .....	2258
Louisiana.....	4339
Maine.....	2649
Mississippi.....	2311
Nebraska.....	2215
New Hampshire.....	2233
North Carolina.....	3451
Quincy.....	2362
Springfield .....	3031
Tennessee.....	4445
Texas .....	2782
Vermont ..	3801
West Michigan.....	3151
West Virginia .....	2485

---

79,227

with 79,227 communicants can out vote the other 24 Dioceses with 325,943 communicants. In other words, (excluding the Missionary Jurisdictions which have no vote in the lower House) a fraction over one-fourth of the communicants of the Church can, as far as the lower House is concerned, under our Constitution, legislate against the will of three-fourths and compel these three-fourths to execute the results of their legislation. Moreover, as the Deputations from the smaller Dioceses are usually not so fully represented in Convention as those from the larger ones the disproportion may be practically increased and, in fact, often is. One lay deputy representing Arkansas with one thousand three hundred and sixty-four Communicants, if he be the only deputy from Arkansas, has an equal vote with the four lay deputies from New York with forty-four thousand two hundred and fifty-six Communicants; and, in fact, he has by the law of chances, a greater voting power, for the four deputies from New York may be equally divided, but the sole deputy from Arkansas will never be divided against himself. In other words twenty-five deputies from one-fifth of the Communicants of the Church may have a greater voting power than ninety-six deputies, representing four-fifths of the Communicants, and these twenty-five may possibly defeat the vote of ninety-six lay deputies, the whole body of clerical Deputies and the House of Bishops. These are, of course, only possibilities representing, however, dangerous practical realities.

Again. Twenty-five Dioceses which give in one year to Foreign Missions, \$8,024.78, can out vote on some question of fundamental importance in missionary organisation, the other twenty-four Dioceses, which give \$314,295.64 to the same object. Those who give one-fortieth can legislate for those who give the thirty-nine fortieths in the questions affecting those contributions.

On looking at it from a another point of view, it is interesting to note the importance into which an ordinary layman may swell and the insignificant proportions into which he may shrink by a change of residence. For instance, the respectable boss lumberman, John Smith, who is a vestryman of S. John's Parish, Dresden, Maine, with ten Communicants, and who is probably a Delegate from his Parish to the Maine Diocesan Convention, where thirty-eight Parishes and Missions are represented, is obliged to become the agent for his lumber company

in New York and takes up his residence there where he becomes a member of Trinity Church with one thousand seven-hundred and ninety-two Communicants. If he have an interest in Church Legislation lingering from his experience in Maine, what must be his chagrin to learn that so far as his voting power in the General Convention is concerned he has shrunk enormously, and is only one seven hundred and twenty-sixth of his former self. Business again prompts him to move, and this time to the flourishing town of Washington, Arkansas, where he becomes a Communicant of Grace Church with nine other Communicants and his voice is again heard in the Church's Legislative Councils. For the John Smith of Arkansas, has learned with delight, that as far as his voting power in the General Convention is concerned, he is equal to one thousand and sixty-one John Smiths of New York. So susceptible is the man who happens to be a Communicant of the Protestant Episcopal Church to the chances and changes of this mortal life.

When we realise that on these conditions depend the legislation of the Church on fundamental questions—questions which touch not tastes or opinions, but principles and consciences and spiritual forces—we may also begin to realise the critical and dangerous position towards which the Church is steadily moving; for the disproportion increases year by year through the centralising forces of population.

What now are the objections to a change which will give the House of Deputies a more representative character? Why should not the number of delegates from the Dioceses be in nearer ratio to the number of communicants, or parishes, or clergy, in each diocese, and why should the Clerical and the Lay delegation of each Diocese vote as a unit?

1. Because such a change would be revolutionary and contrary to the fundamental principles on which the Churches in the different States came together and organised as one body for certain purposes. The condition upon which some of the States insisted, before joining with the others was equal representation with the others; and to disregard that condition is to break the compact and to allow each State, certainly those original States, to legitimately step out of the Confederation; the large body of the Church and not those few Dioceses would have to confess themselves as the seceders. Moreover, when resolutions in favor of a change have been referred by the

General Convention, [as in 1881 and 1883] to the Committee on amendments to the Constitution, that Committee has always reported against a change.

2. Such a change is contrary to all ecclesiastical precedent; never until to day, was it heard that the Diocesan Unit should be broken; never was there known an Ecclesiastical Council that was not formed of Diocesan Units.

With the unbroken precedent of the Church through all her history, unbroken even after our Revolutionary war, when so many precedents of Catholic usage were disregarded, we have no right, no matter what the result, to break down that which the Church has built up.

3. Such a change is contrary to the practice and even the principles of this Church as seen in the Diocesan Constitutions. In at least thirty-two Dioceses, including almost all the older ones, there is not a shade of an attempt at proportional representation. Each Parish, no matter how large or how small has an equal vote.

Through the wisdom of Bishop Hopkins, Vermont really practises what she preaches, and largely through the persistence of Bishop Hopkins' son, John Henry, Central Pennsylvania has just adopted a constitution of Representative character. A few other Dioceses have some representative character but they dare not act fully up to their principles. Dioceses which in 1784 were clamoring for equal representation with the larger ones, now that they have swelled into larger proportions turn around and demand that the small Dioceses shall yield what they refused to give up. "Physician, heal thyself"; "overhaul your own constitution first." While Grace Church, Oxford, Mass., with ten Communicants has an equal vote with Trinity, Boston, with one thousand Communicants; while the same startling disproportions as to numerical representation and to missionary contributions can be shown in the Diocesan Convention of Massachusetts that you have revealed in the General Convention, Massachusetts has no right to demand a revolutionary change there. It is not just for the communicant in a small Massachusetts parish to hold on to his power as a Parochial Unit and then send a delegation to the General Convention to ask for the overthrow of the Diocesan Unit. In fact, even though the number of Delegates to General Convention should be proportional to the number of Communicants in the Diocese,

they cannot be representative of the Diocese until the Diocesan Convention which elects them is representative of the communicants in the Parishes of the Diocese.

4. Such a change would throw an enormous power into the hands of a few large Dioceses, which, centering about the great metropolis and within two hundred miles of that city, in a country three thousand miles broad, would develop a centralising force to which papal Rome in her palmiest days was but a circumstance.

5. Such a change is not necessary to complete the analogy to the House of Representatives. For no signs of analogy exist. "No taxation without representation" is just. Therefore the House of Representatives, which controls hundreds of millions of the people's taxes should be representative. There is no taxation in the Church and the offerings in the hands of the General Convention are paltry. She has to do with other things.

6. The objections to our present system are theoretical not practical: the fact that the discussion is very modern shows that no great harm has come of it. The possible evils are bugbears, which can be matched in the study of any national Constitution. Until the evils of the present system are seen in unjust Legislation, let well enough alone. We have a safety valve in our conservatism and a check in our House of Bishops.

7. The Church is not ready for it; only experts know anything about it; there is no popular demand for the change. Let us hear from the people first. We have heard the complaint in the General Convention through one or two Resolutions, from one or two large Dioceses. But that can hardly be called a cry from the great body of the Church.

Moreover, this whole agitation is nothing but a cat in the bag on the question of the change of Name. In the name of all that is just and honest, do take the question of Representation on its merits and not on any scare about the change of Name nor with an appeal to party cries and sectional spirit.

It is now time to turn and look at the other side of the question—first by answering as briefly as possible the objections named, and then by giving some more positive statements.

1. The change would not be revolutionary and contrary to the fundamental conditions of the original compact. At the close of the Revolutionary War, each of the Dioceses (and they

were then identified with States) felt that it was a Church in itself; but in order to form a national Church they delegated to the National Church Body certain (some say unlimited) powers. When we consider the strong opposition that there was from influential quarters to many of the proposed methods, especially to laymen in Church Councils, we can appreciate the remark of Bishop White, that "the public mind has not yet raised itself to the founding of law on public will." And when Constitutional forms of Amendment are given in the Constitution, it would certainly seem within the power of that representative Body which formed the Constitution, to amend it in Constitutional ways.

Though the Committee on the Constitution in General Convention has always reported against resolutions for a change; they have done so because they felt that it was for the Church first to express a decided wish for the change and that it was not the business of that Committee to originate the movement. They have never reported against the Constitutionality of such an Amendment, nor has its Constitutionality ever been seriously questioned by the Committee.

2. As to the point of the Diocesan Unit and Ecclesiastical precedent, we need not go farther than our Mother Church of England to see that the precedent is often the other way.

Moreover, if each Diocese is a complete Church in itself, and the General Convention only an aggregation of these atoms, are we prepared for the logical result that these atoms may be broken apart at any time? And are we ready to accept the principle of a divided Church within national limits and cast away the thought of a National Church as the ideal of a Universal Church?

We object to the theory of Diocesan Unity as unchurchly and as partaking of the spirit of Congregationalism.

Again, Granted that a change is contrary to all Ecclesiastical precedent and that the Diocesan Unit was never broken, what of it?

Historic precedent is and should be a force in forming new organisations. Past wisdom and experience carry with them great weight and value. It was very natural that when Councils were made up of Bishops, the Diocesan Unit should be preserved in a body of Diocesans. But the question of Hooker, which stands at the head of Bishop White's pamphlet of 1783

is to the point. "To make new articles of faith and doctrine, no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government, what Commonwealth or Church is there which maketh not at one time or another."

And this was just what the Church in America was about. The State was making a Constitution in harmony with the people's will, why not the Church also? having, of course, a full realisation of the value of historic precedent, and Apostolic doctrine and order, and a conviction that the Providence of GOD was just as really in the representative organisation of the Eighteenth Century in America in the oligarchical organisation of the early centuries at Rome. The Church once took some principles of her organisation from the Roman State—why not from the American States. In the admission of laymen to her councils the Church created an entirely new form of organisation which in this respect sets her outside of and beyond historic precedent. It was a movement of great courage and faith, for which we cannot be too thankful. From matters of policy, it stopped short of the civil methods. It did not create a truly representative body of the National Church. The question now is whether we shall go forward and complete the work which the Church a century ago was not able to perfect.

3. To the objection that such a change is contrary to the practice and principles of the Church as seen in the Diocesan Conventions, we answer: It is contrary to the practice, but not to the principles. As we have seen, to the principle of the representation of the laity the Church is committed. The only question is, How shall they be represented, and shall they have a just or an unjust system of representation?

And granted that the Diocesan practice is unrepresentative, two wrongs do not make a right. The National body should first set the example of right organisation and the Diocese will follow suit. To reorganise in the Dioceses first, is to assume to preach to the National Church. But more of this a little later.

4. That such a change would throw an enormous power into the hands of a few large Dioceses in a comparatively small geographical limit, is true, because they are enormous Dioceses and of right the power belongs to them. Representation in Government is not usually figured by the square mile. The quantity, as well as the variety of opinion, should be recog-

nised. There is more opinion in bulk in one thousand men than in ten men. There is no such danger from centralised government in thickly populated countries of educated people where information and publicity is rapid, as there is in sparsely settled districts, where one man or a few men have to act for the whole, and therefore can easily usurp the power which is given to the whole.

5. Granted that the General Convention does not, like the House of Representatives, handle money by the hundreds of millions; it handles money enough to prompt the contributors to ask who has the management of their contributions, and whether it is justly distributed.

Moreover, there are matters which to some have a higher value than money, and when opinions, convictions and principles are at stake, there are some members of the Church who are as anxious to be justly represented as if they had a few hundred dollars, their share of taxes, at the mercy of the legislators.

6. As to the point that the objections to our present system are theoretical not practical.

We agree to the first, if by "theoretical" is meant that which in principle ought to be, but which from reasons of wise policy have not thus far been. But why a correct theory should not be put into practice as soon as it is practicable, it remains for the politician, civil and ecclesiastical, to answer. The reform of civil service was once a theory, and so was representative Government.

That it is fast becoming a practical question is shown by the surprise and indignation with which our present methods are received as soon as they are seen to touch any vital question. And if the practical side is not soon recognised, it will be forced upon us, as the theory of no taxation without representation was once forced upon the English Government.

7. That the Church is not ready for it is perfectly true, and the only answer is to make her ready.

I will reserve for a few moments the relation of this question to that of the change of name.

So much for the objections which I have tried to give and answer fairly.

The positive reasons for a change are fortunately very few, but to my mind very weighty.

1. That the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the General Convention should be as far as is practicable proportionally representative to the numerical strength of the Church is *simply just*.

It is a matter of ethical as well as political import. Among a people trained in the principles of representative Government, such possibilities of gross injustice as we have mentioned will shock their moral sense; the power of a minority, and very small minority, to stifle the voice of the great majority, to block Legislation, to veto every expression from the House of Bishops, to set the Church in an uproar, to create sectional and party spirit and in company with a bare majority of the House of Bishops to withstand the will of the great majority and to legislate in spite of that majority, is what the American citizen, as soon as he realises the facts, will brand as tyrannous and unjust. As we have confidence in the sense of justice among our people and in the ethical spirit of our Church, which will not allow technicalities and precedents to stand in the way of righteousness, so we believe that as soon as the facts and conditions are known by the members of the Church, they will move for and demand a change towards just representation.

2. And, following from the first principle of simple justice, where there is strength there must then be responsibility. The responsibility of administration must go with the power of Legislation. To give votes to the weak will not clothe them with strength to carry out the vote and is fair neither to the weak nor the strong. To refuse a proportionate vote to the strong kills their sense of responsibility for carrying the vote into effect. To say that no evils have yet shown themselves from the present system is to reveal a very slight realisation of the possibilities of the Church. The poorly constructed and ill regulated engine may seem to run well enough; it does not break down or blow up, and the workmen congratulate themselves that there is nothing positively wrong about it. But let the construction be good, the various parts regulated to pressure and wear, the friction decreased and the contrast is immense. We have no right to be content with bad construction where spiritual forces are at stake. Moreover, it is always an uncertain quantity—that possibility of a blow-up and self-destruction.

If the General Convention is to retain the confidence of the

Church, either the minority must have exceptional powers of leadership, prophetic anticipation of the Church's will and great personal power, or else the great body of Deputies must be representative of the Church. The first alternative is one that appeals more to our imagination than to our knowledge of the facts and of human nature: the second alternative is the only reasonable, safe and just one.

Here then we have the summary of reasons for a change towards proportional representation.

It is constitutional; it is according to the Church precedents of conforming her methods of legislation to the forms and spirit of National Legislation, it would put the power where it belongs, and lessen the danger from centralisation. It would allow to the givers of contributions a fair voice in its distribution; it is practical: it would minimise the risk of irritation, of party and sectional spirit and of a break in or from the Church. It is due to simple justice, statesmanship and wise policy.

Now for a few more practical suggestions.

How about a movement for an early change.

- [1.] What are the chances?
- [2.] What form should the change take?
- [3.] What is the immediate duty?

A short look at each of these three and I have done.

[1.] As to the chances of an early change! Poor, I am afraid. Each of the objections named is a source of great friction in the wheels of justice; there is a force in some of them which must be recognised. Then there is the difficulty of rousing enthusiasm or indignation on Constitutional questions; it must come up in the form of a vital or practical issue. We have one now which has started the agitation this time. I said that I would refer again to the "change of Name." Some think that this question, having raised the constitutional issue, is going to help to an early reform. While, of course, it is a gain that through the question of the change of Name attention is called to the unjust representation, yet I think it politically unfortunate that the two are classed together. For, if the issue is pushed, you will have all the small Dioceses, whether they want a change of Name or not, who do not want proportional representation, join forces with the large Dioceses, who do want proportional representation, but who also want the change of Name. The burning issue will come to the front and make

those Dioceses allies, which on the Constitutional issue would be hostile camps, and the Constitutional reform will go to the wall. The two questions this time have got to be fought on their own merits. Later, when the burning question has fallen to ashes, the other Constitutional question will come up on its own merits, or behind another practical popular issue, possibly the unwieldy size into which the lower House is growing. We have this satisfaction that it will never remain down long; its injustice runs too deep and touches the surface too frequently for that. There is moreover the constitutional inertia and conservatism of our Church, and especially of our General Convention, as well as the sensitiveness to changes in laws, which always exists in bodies made up largely of lawyers, statesmen and clergy.

However, there is in its favor the justice of the cause. We must remember that it is a *new* question. There is hardly an article or a speech in existence on the subject as it has come before us in the last few years.\* It is no wonder that the Church is not awake to the crisis. Every reform must have a beginning, and Legislative bodies do reform themselves when popular pressure is brought to bear. The English Reform Bill is a marked instance.

[2.] What form should the change take? Should the basis be proportionate to the number of Parishes, or of Clergy, or of Communicants?

While Parishes vary so much in size that basis would not meet the principle of representation of numbers. The measure by clergy is simpler and was adopted by Prof. Goodwin in his resolution of 1883, because "it has always been used in former legislation for determining the strength of the Church required for the election of a Bishop and for being set off as a new Diocese by the division of an existing Diocese, though in Art. V. Parishes are mentioned." The number of Clergy can be easily and exactly obtained and the census can always be accessible. But this measure exaggerates the strength of a few large Dioceses where unemployed clergy are most liable to congregate and it does not meet the principle.

With the number of *Communicants* as a basis there would, to

\*I am indebted to the Church Congress of 1881 and of 1887; to Rev. D. R. Goodwin, D.D., Rev. J. H. Hopkins, D.D., James S. Biddle, Esq., to other friends, and especially to Rev. T. M. Peters, D.D.

be sure, be the added temptation, which is strong enough now, to doctor up the Communicant list. But that meets the principle, and in consistency to principle lies the strength of our cause.

Each Diocese might be allowed one clerical and one lay representative and one more of each order for a certain number of thousands of Communicants.

For to increase the size of the present General Convention by adding representatives to the present eight from each Diocese is out of the question: to cut up the large Dioceses into small ones and so multiply; their representative force is too slight a gain to pay for the loss in other respects, unless, of course, the Diocese is divided for other good reasons. Is some form of a provincial system out of the question? with principles as far as possible in harmony with our American methods and with a Representative National Synod meeting only once in five years? I am not sure that with our great country and our present form of Government we may not wisely come to such methods, and so bring about proportional representation, which may not come in any other way.

[3, and finally.] What is the immediate duty?

First—Agitate! agitate! Give publicity to the facts. Let the people know the conditions and the dangers, and then trust to them under wise leadership to rouse and demand a reform.

Second—Press in the Diocesan Conventions a reform there. There is great force in that argument "Physician heal thyself." The movement must come from the Dioceses, and must first be seen and felt in Diocesan reforms. The taunt is true that Parishes which wilt not yield their Parochial unit vote to send Delegates to General Convention demanding the overthrow of the Diocesan unit.

[3.] Let those Dioceses who want the change join with each other, by consultation and united action bring definite and multiplied force upon that the General Convention and rouse it to a high idea of true policy, wise statesmanship and simple justice.

WILLIAM LAWRENCE.

### Mr. Crawford's Latest Novels.

IF we had been asked, half a dozen years ago, to point out the novelist of the moment whose interpretation of the facts of life, and whose theory of living seemed to us the most sober, rational and complete, we should certainly not have chosen the author of *Mr. Isaacs*. Yet it would be with the name of F. Marion Crawford that we should instantly respond to such a challenge to-day, passing over even that of the author of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. For although the two writers have many points of what we may call moral likeness, Mr. Stevenson shows his rightness of judgment in regard to problems rather apart from the normal daylight side of life, leaving Mr. Crawford alone in the presentation, under a far from ordinary light of conscience and common sense, of the ordinary external world of the novelist. We do not mean that all the characters he draws are good and wise, nor even conscientious and sensible. On the contrary, many of them are bad and foolish, and all have faults—unless, perhaps, the good priest, Don Paolo, in *Marzio's Crucifix*—but what we mean is that all the men and women whom Mr. Crawford brings before us, he brings not as puppets, not as the toys of fate, not merely as natural curiosities to be observed, but as moral beings, creatures accountable to one above them, and possessing a power of choice and will. He writes, in short, as a Christian, and there is a certain novelty about it.

For, as most students of contemporary fiction during the the present half century must have perceived, that tone has been for some time unfashionable. We have had religious novels, of course, but they form as it were a class apart; the the novelist who aimed at writing of the world for the world, has reflected doubt, negation, agnosticism; has left faith to be an adornment of his weaker characters, and directed our admiration to people who had outgrown that sort of thing, or who had always seen it under such an aspect as to be opposed to it, on grounds not difficult to justify. It is not so long ago that

this non-Christian attitude was an innovation, adopted as a resisting of conventional rules, as an act of courageous honesty; but it has passed that stage and become conventional itself. This fact we are made to realise, with a sense of amusement at the rapidity with which the world moves, by Mr. Crawford's defiance of this last convention, and the boldness with which he puts forward men who are neither stupid nor ignorant, but who are decided believers and do not at all aspire to that lofty flexibility of mind which enabled Daniel Deronda to transfer himself from the Church to the Synagogue without, apparently, noticing the change. Daniel was a beautiful shadow, and he has been imitated in a good many shadows which are not beautiful; but our own preference is for an art that represents living men of solid substance and active force, ruled by conviction and principle rather than by sentiment only. If this looks like insensibility to the magic of George Eliot's genius, we must at once clear ourselves from any such imputation by declaring that we intend no comparison at all between her gifts and those of the novelist whose view of life we so much prefer to hers. Such comparison is impossible: neither the poetic insight nor the keen humour with which George Eliot reached the heart of her readers is likely to be repeated for many a generation.

We have heard Mr. Crawford likened to Sir Walter Scott, and in this there is reason. The Waverley Novels were written at a time when popular thought was wholly under the influence of the Christian religion. Whether men did what that religion commands, whether they understood it rightly or not, still, it cannot be denied that it was then the constant basis of their theories of life, and the fixed standard to which they appealed. But since that time, until the last few years, the general tendency of active thought has been towards the shaking of things established, the questioning of things received. This radical inquisition has left nothing undisturbed; it has asked *why?* of all that we believe, all that we do, of the very frame-work of our lives. Its one unquestioned idol has been the search for truth; its one human feeling a sense of pity for the oppressed. It is a glorious advance in these respects upon some earlier conditions of the human mind; it shows a new enlargement of human capacity; but in its exclusive devotion to science and sympathy it has arrested the development of cer-

tain other things, necessary to the continued existence of these as to their original evolution. An instance of this occurs in an otherwise most excellent article on American education in the *Westminster Review* [July, 1887]. Speaking of "the conflict between the various religious sects" which prevents the teachers in the public schools from appealing to "any coherent system of moral sanctions," the writer says:

Indeed, I am inclined to think that the impossibility of imparting a systematic moral training in the public schools would soon make these schools themselves impossible, if the present condition of things were destined to last. But I do not think that this is likely to be the case. . . . . The popular religion, though seldom openly attacked, is gradually, by the simple force of enlightenment, sinking into the position of a tolerated form of charlatanry, alongside the once respectable alchemy and astrology. When it has fairly taken this position, and its place in the hearts of men is filled by an ethical system based on science, . . . . . the public schools will be able to inculcate moral conduct by means of sanctions scientifically established, and as universally recognised as are the laws of health.

There could hardly be a term more indefinite than "the popular religion" when one is speaking of the people of the United States. When Mr. Matthew Arnold used the phrase with regard to England, it conveyed an idea sufficiently distinct for the purposes of his argument; but here there is nothing to answer to it. In America we have probably nearly all the forms of religion which the world contains, and what point have they in common? They have one. They are, each and all, the expression of a natural human instinct, a true human consciousness, no more to be suppressed or eliminated than hunger or thirst, or than the tendency to explore, to learn, to love, to make, to acquire. It is against an instinct, then, that the writer in the *Westminster* is armed when he tells us: "that same (the popular) religion is the greatest obstacle now existing to the advancement of pure morality, freedom, and social well-being in the United States." But he certainly does not need us to tell him that instincts cannot be destroyed; they can be trained and developed, or they can be left to run wild; and, in our opinion, the evils of which he so justly complains among us result, not from religion, but from the untrained condition of the religious instinct, of that faculty of which religion is the natural expression.

To deny to any faculty, to an integral part of one's nature, its due and right exercise, is to produce such feelings of weariness without exertion, and dreariness without loss, as we sum up by saying we are "bored." It is a state of mind much studied, much represented, and, we must be permitted to say, much induced, by the makers of light literature in the last fifty years. You do not find it in Scott. The world presented in novels seems to have taken up the fashion of being bored at about the same time with the fashion of doing without religion. Both fashions are discarded in Mr. Crawford's pages, and herein lies his likeness to Sir Walter. The vigor of his style, the manly energy of life which he is capable of shewing in his characters, the hearty interest which he feels, and makes us feel, in them, their deeds and their experiences, all come from the *wholeness* of his conception of human life. He does not hide the evil, the baseness that is in the world, but neither does he ignore what is in it by reason of the facts of the Christian Faith. It is not that he chooses subjects more inspiring than those of other writers, nor that he is less able than they to understand the average man. *Marzio's Crucifix*, one of the two novels published by him within the past year, is a study, as sympathetic as condemnatory, of a type of character peculiar in time to the present half century, but peculiar to no country of the civilised world. He is everywhere, this fanatic possessed with the idea of destroying civilisation for the sake of an impossible equality between man and man. Marzio's untrained instincts of justice and pity, running wild in this manner, come near finding expression in a deed of murderous cruelty. He is an epitome of the faults, not of his nation only, but of his time, and if we can look on the picture without despair, it is because, in the Italian and the Anarchist, Mr. Crawford is still able to see the man, and the man's responsibility for the characteristics of the type.

Considered merely as a story, *Marzio's Crucifix* must rank below either of the two books—*Saracinesca* and *Paul Patoff*—which appeared, the one just before, and the other just after it. *Paul Patoff*, though we occasionally feel that a trifle more condensing might have improved it, is full of interest, both in the contrasted characters of the two Russian brothers, with whose story it is mainly concerned, and in the brilliant background made for them by the vivid picture of Stamboul. We

have seldom read anything more striking than this description of the Agia Sophia, "viewed at night from the solitude of the vast galleries, during the religious ceremonies of the last week in the month Ramazan."

Far down in the vast church an Imaum was intoning a passage of the Koran in a voice which hardly seemed human; indeed, such a sound is probably not to be heard anywhere else in the world. The pitch was higher than what is attainable by the highest men's voices elsewhere, and yet the voice possessed the ringing manly quality of the tenor, and its immense volume never dwindled to the proportions of a soprano. The priest recited and modulated in this extraordinary key, introducing all the ornaments peculiar to the ancient Arabic chant with a facility which an operatic singer might have envied. Then there was a moment's silence, broken again almost immediately by a succession of heavy sounds which can only be described as resembling rhythmical thunder, rising and falling three times at equal intervals; another short but intense silence, and again the voice burst out with the wild clang of a trumpet, echoing and reverberating through the galleries and among the hundred marble pillars of the vast temple.

The two brothers walked forward to the carved stone balustrade of the high gallery, and gazed down from the height upon the scene below. The multitude of worshippers surged like crested waves blown obliquely on a shingly shore. For the apse of the Christian Church is not built so that facing it the true believer shall look toward Mecca, and the Mussulmans have made their *mihrab*—their shrine—a little to the right of what was once the altar, in the true direction of the sacred city. The long lines of matting spread on the floor all lie evenly at an angle with the axis of the nave, and when the mosque is full the whole congregation, amounting to thousands of men, are drawn up like regiments of soldiers, in even ranks, to face the *mihrab*, but not at right angles with the nave. . . . There they stand, the ranks of the faithful, as they have stood yearly for centuries in the last week of Ramazan. As the trumpet notes of each recited verse dies away among the arches, every man raises his hands above his head, then falls upon his knees, prostrates himself, and rises again, renewing the act of homage three times with the precision of a military evolution. At each prostration, performed exactly and simultaneously by that countless multitude, the air is filled with the tremendous roar of muffled rhythmical thunder, in which no voice is heard, but only the motion of ten thousand human bodies, swaying, bending and kneeling in unison. Nor is the sound alone impressive. From the vaulted roof, from the galleries, from the dome itself, are hung hun-

dreds of gigantic chandeliers. . . . This whole flood of glorious illumination descends then to the floor of the nave, and envelops the ranks of white and green clothed men, who rise and fall in long sloping lines, like a field of corn under the slanting breeze.

*Marzio's Crucifix* contains nothing like that, on the one hand; nor on the other is it equal to *Saracinesca* in plot, in variety of incident, and in the interest of the characters. The romance is prosaic compared with that of Giovanni and Corona, and there is no figure equal in humorous and pathetic charm to the dear, brave, old blundering gentleman who is Giovanni's father. But, looking beyond the mere story, it has more significance than the later book, and to the earlier is, in one respect, equal, in another superior. It is equal to *Saracinesca* in giving, of a special class of Roman society, a picture which, while not concealing the faults and dangers of these people, shows yet the good which remains in them, and through which they are united with all mankind in a great hope. It is superior in its clear indication of the nature and foundation of that hope.

We do not hear from Mr. Crawford of "the decadence of Italy;" we hear of an Italian who indulges himself in two very commonplace faults, vanity and ill-temper, at the same time laying aside his faith in, and obedience to, all religion. He cuts himself off from this at the point where it had brought him—as it has brought Christendom—to the enlarged power of imaginative sympathy of which we spoke above. But, separated from Christian Faith and obedience, this Christian instinct of compassion, growing—as some one has said—"as impatient of suffering as if it were sin," comes to believe "that poverty is the master-evil." After this there is a logic in Socialism, and it needs a clearer head than Marzio's to say where the line may be drawn, beyond which the tendency to Nihilism shall not proceed. What right have I, the fanatic may ask in all sincerity, to retain as my own what another man desires? Is any sort of inequality justifiable? Has society a right to protect itself? A scientific system of ethics may reply: Yes; because the present constitution of society is for the greatest good of the greatest number. But even if we accept that assertion, the question remains: Have the greatest number a right to be happy at the expense of the few? And when men, professing to be representatives of the few, answer

this question all over the world with a great cry of misery and rage, it concerns every one of us to know on what grounds we are willing to maintain against them the defence of the social order. There is no little aid to such knowledge in the study of Marzio's character, displayed as it is in his relation to his art, to his wife, daughter, apprentice and brother, and to the group of men whom he likes to harangue over a pint of wine at the Falcone. We are made to see very clearly how poor and vain a shadow the love of Humanity becomes, when it ceases to be the love of GOD and of our neighbor. The passion for freedom, for equal rights, for open sincerity, is degraded with fatal logic into wilful obstinacy, loveless tyranny and the secret plotting of a cowardly crime. The deterioration of the man's own nature under the influence of his theories may measure what those theories are worth to the world.

But what shall we give the world in place of them? Something must be given: Nihilism is not an effect without a cause, neither will it remain a cause without an effect. The few whom even now its mad utterances do not disgust "increase and grow to be a root, and send out shoots and creepers like an evil plant, so that grave men say among themselves that if there is to be a universal war in our times or hereafter, it will be fought by Christians of all denominations defending themselves against those who are not Christians." Yet there is a better war which may be fought instead of this, if the "mighty army" be aroused in time. It was Paolo's faith uttered in a life of righteousness and strength as well as in the words which are true for all those who, though they are not Christians, are yet men, just as they were true for Marzio—*Qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de cælis*—it was Paolo's faith, after all, that, humanly speaking, carried the spark of life into Marzio's soul. We have all felt the depression and perplexity with which one, on Dover Beach, heard "the melancholy long withdrawing roar" of the "sea of faith." But there are signs already that the tide has turned, and we welcome such work as Mr. Crawford's as spray, at least, from a mighty, in-coming wave.

G. E. MEREDITH.

## The Study of The Christian Fathers.

*The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Edited by the Right Rev. A. C. COXE, D.D., LL.D., and *the Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1885 & 1886.

UGHT the clergy to study the Fathers? is a question frequently asked by men not unmindful of their ordination vows. To us it seems as a subject admitting of no discussion. An architect might as well ask a client, "Do you want any windows in your house?" Every Christian is a child of light and not of darkness. Much more then is a Priest of the Most High, not only a child of light but a bearer of the Light. Illumined at baptism. Illuminating since his ordination. If GOD declared to the Jewish Church, "And I will give you pastors according to my heart which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding" shall we neglect the prophetic command of Malachi to Christian priests and people, "That the priest's lips should seek knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth for he is the messenger of the LORD of Hosts," and bring the curse upon ourselves and our people proclaimed by Hosea, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge; because thou hast rejected knowledge I will also reject thee that thou shalt be no priest to me."

There are no more melancholy pages in the history of the Christian Church than those bearing the record of the literal fulfilment of these prophecies. And if men and women in this wide continent are estranged from the Church of GOD and are wandering in the twilight, following as S. Augustine expressly warned them not to do, in the footsteps of the other sheep, instead of in that of the shepherd is it not through lack of knowledge? They know not the ancient paths. Is it any marvel that they have forgotten the one way to the one door in the one fold.

That branch of the Catholic Church to which we have the undeserved honor of belonging, and perhaps the heavy responsibility of being priests therein has the distinguishing characteristic of basing her claim to obedience upon "The Bible and the Fathers." She, having the boldness of a good conscience, has not only set before her clergy a high standard of learning, but is unique in demanding of her lay children knowledge. She has given her children an open Bible, and an open Book of Common Prayer. She therefore expects all her children to know at least how to read, and read fluently. None but a fluent reader can obey her injunction to respond in her services. The printing press is her handmaid. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say, that of the sacred literature issued, over seventy-five per cent. is written, or published, by the sons and daughters of the Anglican communion. She distributes freely and without price, her handbook, the Bible.

Whence do members of the sister Church of Rome seek for weapons against the Protestant sects, but from the English arsenal, and from that same store-house do the sectarians derive their arms against Rome. In the past it was said that the English clergy were on account of their learning *stupor mundi*. Though not so apparent latterly it is doubtful whether it is not still true of them. May it never cease being so.

Some may say, "knowledge of the Fathers may be very well to antiquarians but to us, progressive men of the nineteenth century, the Fathers are out of date, and such knowledge not required. What! was not the Faith once delivered to the Saints? And if we talk of being progressive may we not soon err in thinking that the Faith can be progressive? The Faith is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Knowledge alone of the Faith may be progressive. What is knowledge? Is it not the acquisition of facts? Now facts can only live in the past. Theory which is but the hope of knowledge lives in the future. Theory when realised becomes a fact, and passes into the past. Therefore we have in our study of the Faith only the past to study. Then comes the question what portion of the past? Common sense answers at once, we must begin with the remotest past, or else we shall be like a child learning its A B C backwards, or a man reading from right to

left. Such feats are only curious. Does a student come to be instructed in English history, is that professor honest who tells him to commence with William III, or to begin with the reign of Victoria? Would a teacher of American history be competent who taught his scholars only such history as dated from Washington or since the death of Garfield?

Let the same common sense be brought to bear on the history of the Faith. Shall the study of that Faith begin at some intermediate point, shall it commence with Cranmer or Pusey? or shall it start from Seabury or De Koven?

Some, inconceivable as it may appear, think they can best learn the history of the Faith, by commencing their studies from Calvin, or Knox, or perchance from Wesley. As well might the student of history, English or American, start from Tamerlane, Gustavus of Sweden or Garibaldi.

The common sense, GOD has given us, must be used as well in the history of the Faith, as in every other history. We must go back to the beginning and learn to follow the stream of time till it brings us to the present. The facts of the Faith are what we want. For them the past must be ransacked. Theories of the Faith are what the Church calls heresies. They are vain imaginings begotten of ignorance. What then is the remotest past of the Christian Faith? The creation. Since that is a long stretch of time, it may fairly be divided into two portions. Before CHRIST, and after CHRIST. What a Christian priest needs to know of the first period is summarised in that history of the period which the Church has called the Old Testament. Now for the second period, since the new creation. Has the Church given us a handbook or history of that period? She has not. Why? Because we are still in the seventh day of the creation. The new creation is not completed. Therefore the Church cannot close the volume. Such chapters as she could finish she has, as dealing with that portion of the new creation which can never be undone, the life of CHRIST on earth. The Church has, and very wisely, closed that installment of her history. It was not hurriedly done, for the sacred canon was not closed authoratively till at least 397, though much leads us to believe that it was in practice held as closed on the death of S. John. Adding to "the Good

Tidings" writings penned by some of the Apostles, or men of the Apostolic age, the Church called the whole volume, the New Testament. In the two Testaments or Bible, we have a deposit of Faith, of the Christian Faith. So that the only book which the Church has given into our hands concerning the history of the Faith does not give us a single incident later than about the year 70 A. D. Before seeking any knowledge about events subsequent to A. D. 70 we are met in our quest of truth with this demand. Prove the authenticity of the Sacred Canon. How are we going to prove it? By the book itself. That is impossible. Unless somewhere in the universe there is a standard copy which had come down from Heaven direct. There is but one way. That way is by an appeal to the contemporary Christian writers when the Canon was being framed. These contemporary writers we call "The Fathers." Hence to prove the Bible we have to go to the Fathers. The Church of England therefore appeals to the Bible and the Fathers, and in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer, says that the first and original ground of Divine worship has to be searched out by the ancient Fathers; and she unhesitatingly declares her Order for Prayer and reading of the Holy Scriptures to be much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers. The Church of England, then, in the only book which she, as a branch of the Catholic Church, has authoritatively put forward, shows her opinion of the value of the study of the Fathers. Members, however, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, may reply: "We revere the Church of England, but our Church has omitted from her Prayer Book, the old preface, and has written a brand new one in which those references to the Fathers are omitted, and she does not therefore lay so much stress on the value of the Fathers."

Pardon, the American Church, in her Articles of Religion, makes the validity of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament to depend entirely on the Fathers, and relies upon S. Jerome, one of the Fathers, for her commendation of the Apocrypha.

She makes her article on original sin perfectly unintelligible to any one not versed in the writings of Clemens Romanus,

Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian and Augustine. The article on works before justification is equally obscure without recourse to Clement of Alexandria and Augustine. The thirty-ninth article refers to S. Augustine in direct terms. In the thirty-ninth article the American Church boldly and rightly declares that any one, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, openly breaking the traditions and the ceremonies of the Church (that is, not of the American Church, but of the whole Catholic Church), is to be rebuked openly. The Prayer Book does not inform inquirers what these traditions and ceremonies are. Where are they to be found? Only by study of the Fathers.

The American Church distinctly lays down that twenty-one Homilies are to be received by her children as an explication of Christian doctrine. What Homilies are there which do not bristle on every page with references to the Fathers? Besides the special articles to which attention has been drawn, the slightest study of the articles will reveal what a great knowledge of the Fathers the framers of those articles had, and how anxious they were, in everything they drew up, to be guided entirely by those Fathers. No man can understand the history of the Reformation who is ignorant of the Fathers. It was a passionate appeal to the Fathers against the new doctrines of Rome or Geneva. The American Church bases her very vindication of the three-fold ministry by an appeal to the Fathers in the preface to her ordinal, and without going into further details, she has, while altering much of the English Prayer Book, steadfastly kept on the title page that the Common Prayer, the Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, are not those of the American Church, but of "the Church"—that is, of the Catholic Church—and are only modified according to the use of the American Church; just as one Diocese modifies the ritual of the Prayer Book itself, according to its own use, or a bishop, as in the recent case of Litchfield, sets forth the liturgical colors to be used throughout his Diocese. The American Church, therefore, still keeps on her very title page an appeal to the Fathers, and every Churchman desirous of understanding the inner meaning of his Prayer Book has to ascend the stream of

time far beyond the Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, or the Reformation in England, beyond S. Osmund, S. Augustine of Canterbury, and even beyond the two great Fathers, S. Gregory and S. Leo, and through the Ante-Nicene Fathers and the Pauline Epistles, till he almost touches the threshold of the first Christian oratory, that upper room in which our High Priest was Himself the celebrant.

Priests are bound by their ordination vows to a study of the Fathers, that being the study which helps to a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. How can they instruct others in the knowledge of the Catholic Faith, and not break Catholic traditions and ceremonies, unless they know what the Catholic Faith, traditions and ceremonies are?

If the aphorism of Bacon, that "Reading maketh a full man," is ever true, it must be true of the clergy. If ever a leader needs to be filled, and filled up to the brim, surely it is that teacher upon whose teaching depends the fate of thousands in this world and the next. How are they going to prove any article of the Faith or defend any custom of the Church? If they do not study the Fathers, where is their authority in disobeying the fourth Commandment, which is a terrible responsibility, since it was a direct command from GOD Himself? Yet it is to be trusted that all disobey it, and that none open their churches on the Sabbath only, and that they are careful to enjoin on their people to work hard on the Sabbath, but to rest on the LORD'S Day. Where is their authority for breaking GOD'S commandment? Not in the Bible. A curious publication, issued by the American Sabbath Tract Society, called *The Outlook and Sabbath Quarterly*, takes the logical view of the matter, and advocates the abolition of the Sunday and the restoration of the Sabbath. As showing the trend of sectarianism, we quote the following from the July issue, p. 515:

One thing is evident. The Sabbath question will find vent in some marked movement within a few years. The religious world is being deeply moved by the claims of the Sabbath as against the Sunday. The conscience of the more GOD-fearing ones is awakening. It can be satisfied only by discarding Sunday as non-Protestant, and re-

turning to the Sabbath, or by some heroic effort to reinstate the failing Sunday. Everything indicates that whatever efforts are to be made will centre round the Civil law. The theological basis on which Sunday rests is too limited and uncertain to furnish grounds for contending armies in its favor.

It will no doubt be a surprise to many that such a sect is strong enough to boast of an organ of its own. It is, however, but the logical outcome of that same Puritanism which sought under Cromwell to restore the Mosaic dispensation. Protestantism has always struck us as a modern form of Judaism. These *Seventh-day-of-the-week-Sabbatarians* (which we gather to be their proper title) are, like all extremists, strongly opposed to the opportunists of their faction. The bulk of their arguments is directed against their fellow Protestants who persist in calling the first day of the week the Sabbath. No little research is shown to prove that the Sabbath is one thing and the Sunday another; that every standard dictionary in the principal languages gives Saturday as the Sabbath, and not Sunday; that the Greek and Roman Churches still call the seventh day the Sabbath, and that those who persist in calling the first day of the week the Sabbath are wrong morally, historically and logically. All this is perfectly true, and unanswerable so long as the Bible, and the Bible only, is taken as the interpreter of GOD's will. The position of Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, etc., who, while rejecting the authority of the Church in everything that tells against them, yet blindly accept the Church's dictum as to the Sunday, is certainly a curious phenomenon. Nor is their position strengthened by their endeavor to escape from their illogical attitude by a jugglery of words, by a solemn make-believe that the first day of the week is the seventh, and that the Sunday is the Sabbath. Calling the first day of the week the Sabbath does not make it the Sabbath, no more than calling a layman a presbyter or a bishop makes him either presbyter or bishop. The existence of such a Sabbatarian sect should be a warning to Churchmen not to minimise their own position, but to stand firm on the ground the Reformers took, "The Bible and the Ancient Fathers."

The Bible alone may not give us the authority we need for

disobeying the fourth Commandment, but the Bible and the Fathers will.

Where is the defense of the Church against the Baptist heresy? The command of the Prayer Book? That is nothing. That is only a private set of rules binding on members of a local church. The American bishops have themselves proclaimed observance to them non-essential to unity. In the Bible? The Bible is not very satisfactory. But ask the Fathers for help, and S. Augustine declares their mind when he says, *Regula antiqua fidei baptizare parvulos*, and again, *Hoc Ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit*. Before the steady light thrown on this subject by the Fathers, the will-o'-the-wisp phantasies of Brown and his followers, the modern Baptists, vanish into thin air.

What is the Church's defense of Episcopacy?

Church people may call themselves, or allow themselves to be called, "Episcopalians," but that is no argument. There are plenty of other kinds of Episcopalians springing up throughout the American land. The Prayer Book is no answer to a Presbyterian, but the Prayer Book puts the Churchman on the track of where to find the proof of Episcopacy. It refers all men to the old Fathers. After teaching them, the Churchman is able to repeat the unanswered challenge of a Father of the English Church:

We require you to find out but one church upon the face of the whole earth that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say by Episcopal regiment, sithence the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant. [Hooker's preface to his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, cap. iv., § i.]

Further, if the Churchman says that a man who does anything apart from the bishop, the presbytery, and the deacons is not of a pure conscience, he is but saying what one of the very earliest Fathers has declared.

S. Cyprian gives us the keynote of the Catholic Faith in this as against Protestant negation by his terse saying, *Ecclesia in Episcopo*, and equally by that condemns the Vatican theories which would read Cyprian's motto, *Ecclesia in Papa*.

When the Churchman, or his clergy, is called upon to de-

fend the sacramental rite of Confirmation, it is again to the Fathers that he has to have recourse. Century by century they bear witness to the gift of the HOLY GHOST in His seven-fold fullness in Confirmation.

Does an intemperate brother declare that an unfermented beverage can be used as a substitute for wine in the Holy Mysteries? He is asked not to break the traditions of the Catholic Church, and again appeal is made to the Fathers in support of that request.

Does some half educated Churchman complain of the mixed chalice he is referred also to the Fathers. Justin Martyr and S. Cyprian will silence him. Is the wine to be red or white. S. Cyprian and S. Augustine answer red.

Does some Roman controversialist seek to depress the Episcopacy to exalt the Bishop of Rome, the Anglican Churchman blandly asks him to prove his position from an unforged edition of the Fathers.

Are any uncertain to the degree of honor they should render to the Blessed Virgin Mary, let them turn to the Fathers. There they will find reverence, but not worship accorded to her. The position of the Anglican Church vindicated against Romanism and Protestantism.

Is a priest remembering the solemn authority given him to forgive sins, at his ordination, desirous of knowing what he ought to teach his flock, he will find that the Catholic Church has nowhere enjoined, nor the early Fathers recommended, enforced confession. Is the claim that infallibility rests in the See of Rome pressed. The reply is that the Fathers knew of no such claim. That Irenæus and Hippolytus teach us that if the Faith was preserved at all in Rome it was by the constraining influence of all other Christian churches. In other words it was by the mutual interdependence of all the Church and not of the *ipsi dixit* of the Bishop of Rome.

Are we down hearted at the aspect of hydra-headed heresy and the rapid growth of some of the sects let us take courage from the fact that heresies and sects more powerful than those of this generation have had their day and passed away. That without the Fathers we should not know of their very existence. They are like the flies preserved in the amber, or like

the ancient forms of unknown vegetation preserved to us in the teeth of the mastodon and mammoth. And do we want to prove the authority of one Father, we do so by another. So with every point of doctrine or practice. Does a sectarian like the fox without a tail, seek to liken the Church to his sect, and pretend that we like him cannot trace the origin of our society beyond a century or two, how can we prove our identity with the Church of Apostolic or Sub-Apostolic ages, but by an intimate knowledge of the Fathers?

More than that, how can the loving words of our Blessed LORD be shown to be true and that His abiding presence, and the energising presence of the HOLY GHOST has been with the Church since Pentecost if we have no means of tracing the continuity of the Church, century by century, decade by decade? The Fathers are the torch-bearers of the Light. Their torches may be full of smoke and impurities incident on their origin, and they may have held these torches unsteady or unskillfully. Still those torches were lighted from those held by the Apostles which were kindled of the HOLY GHOST. At no time has the torch been allowed to fall to the ground, but age by age men have sprung from darkness to grasp the torch from the stiffening hand and running their allotted space have in turn passed on the living flame.

The children of the Church may still be children of light, and her priests the *illuminati* of the earth.

In these anxious times, for to the living all times are anxious, are we in doubt how to steer the ark of the Church between the Scylla of Rome, and the Charybdis of Geneva let us take the Fathers as our beacon lights.

In this recommendation of the study of the Fathers there may be opposed the practical question, "How can a man study the Fathers?" Two requisites are needed. Time and learning. The first requisite lies with each man to furnish. The busiest man is he who has most time. The man who has no time to read is perhaps the man who talks too much; and is assuredly the man who needs the most to read. The second requisite is met by the publication of the Fathers, by the Christian Literature Company, of New York. In a less busy age, when the clergy had fewer calls on their time, the Fathers

could only be studied in Latin or Greek. A study requiring more leisure was meet for a more leisurely age. In this age a parish priest has to be "an all round man," and do a great deal of work which he ought not to be called upon to do. Still in the unorganised condition of the Church in this century the clergy have either to do the work or leave it undone. All men have now more demands on their time than their fathers had; consequently it is a great privilege and help to be able to read the Fathers in English. No matter how scholarly a man may be, his mother tongue will always be easier to him. A busy man can now have by his study table all the Fathers of the Church, and by devoting a few hours a week to the reading of them, can become better versed in Patristic literature than his forefathers could in the course of years. He has moreover the advantage of a more accurate translation of the whole works than he could in nine cases out of ten himself render. In matters of nice scholarship, or of honest controversy, he can still examine isolated passages in the original, with perhaps a better chance of getting at the true meaning of the authority through his familiarity with the mind of the writer which a quick reading of a whole book almost invariably gives. It is assuredly better for nine-tenths of the clergy throughout the world to read the Holy Scripture in the Authorised Version than to read them only in the originals. The Authorised Version is certainly superior to what any individual no matter how scholarly can produce. Likewise it is certainly better for the clergy and intellectual laymen to read the Fathers in such a version as that referred to, than in the original only; or as is most likely not at all. Ignorance of the Fathers ought henceforth to be a reproach on any priest. The method of purchase of this series is also a recommendation. A volume which cost three dollars, or three dollars and fifty cents, can be bought say once every three months. All men can spare, or deny, themselves a dollar a month, if they cannot let them order a volume once in six months. In this way, imperceptibly, at no inconvenience to themselves, in the course of three or four years they will have a better Patristic library than even Bishops have or had. As ignorance is the mother of heresy, so the more widespread is the knowledge of the fathers the sooner

will we reach the goal of all our hearts—Unity—which is a synonym for truth.

In saying these words of commendation of the Ante-Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers as issued by the "*Christian Literature Company*," it is not to be supposed that even that edition is perfect, though it may be well considered the most complete as yet issued. One of its chiefest disadvantages to students lies in its very poor and imperfect indexes. Let the very first volume of the Nicene and Post-Nicene series be taken, that containing the confession and letters of S. Augustine. Under the head of *Baptism* we find no references to Regeneration by Baptism, or forgiveness of sins at Baptism for example: pages 118, 131, 134 (note), 130, 133 and many more ought all to have been referred to under these heads. Take again the *Holy Eucharist*, and what a meagre list of references to that Sacrament do we find, and one of the few given is wrongly given—p. 138 instead of p. 139. Under *Sui* we find references given to forgiveness of sins after Baptism, but none *at* baptism. Yet does not Augustine's grateful exclamation "Thou, O most Merciful LORD, pardoned and remitted this sin also, with my others so horrible and so deadly in the holy water" [p. 130] come to most minds? No reference is made to the allusion to the *Sursum Corda* on p. 192; nor to the offering "of the sacrifice of our Redemption" as Augustine calls it, at the funeral of his mother [p. 139].

Many more instances might be given. Poor and faulty indexes are great blots on such a work. The Churchman is also warned to read the notes of the editor of S. Augustine—Dr. Philip Schaff—with a very critical eye. They are full of false deductions and eccentric statements. We enter an emphatic protest for example against such assertions as the following, which are only a sample:

The Catholic Church has become a Roman Church. p. 20.

In Reformation is a new creation. p. 22. (note.)

The Anglican Church allows two opposite views (on baptismal regeneration) and sanctions the one in the baptismal service of the Book of Common Prayer, the other in her thirty-nine Articles and other standards (?) as interpreted by the low Church or Evangelical party in a moderately Calvinistic sense. p. 23.

Augustine modified the hierarchical and sacramental character of the Church. p. 24.

Catholicism is the strength of Romanism; Romanism is the weakness of Catholicism. p. 24.

The Augustinian system . . . trained the most virtuous, independent and heroic types of Christians, as the Huguenots, the Puritans, the Covenanters and the Pilgrim Fathers. p. 17.

Even Dr. Schaff will, we hope, agree that all these statements of his are not expressions of matters set at rest, but rather that they are all points in dispute and not marks of unity—among Christians, or even among Anglican Churchmen.

His calm assumption throughout that Protestantism, and especially Calvinistic Protestantism, must be right, is amusing. His frequent stabs at Rome are also unwise in an edition which is meant to be read by all conditions of men, and so bring them all to a knowledge of the Primitive Church.

It would have been far better, and rendered this edition of the Fathers more valuable than it can ever now become, had the wise reserve of Bishop Coxe in the notes on the Authors edited by him, been followed by Dr. Schaff. One rises from the perusal of Dr. Schaff's *Prædilectio* with the conviction that, if the Protestant theory set forth by Guizot and endorsed by him had been in practice in the first four centuries, there would have been no Christianity to survive the storm, which is perhaps not quite the deduction he would wish any reader to make. However, if readers are careful to peruse the Author *first*, and the foot-notes and prefaces afterwards, with the recollection that they are selected and written from the Protestant and Presbyterian point of view, not much harm will come to them.

Nevertheless it is to be hoped that the Fathers as yet unedited, will contain more of the author and less of the editor, with indexes that will be helps and not hindrances to an accurate knowledge of the contents.

We have felt compelled to give this warning. Let not the warning be a damper to action, but rather an incentive. It is to a study of the Fathers that we would bring every priest, and not to a neglect of them.

All noble minds seek Truth, for GOD is Truth. Wisdom is

the human aspect of Truth. By wisdom is Truth found. Knowledge leads to wisdom; ignorance to vice. "But vice shall not prevail against wisdom" the wise man has said, and every teacher of the Word of GOD should apply his heart unto wisdom, and be able, personally, to feel the truth of the saying of Solomon :

I learned diligently, and do communicate wisdom liberally. I do not hide her riches. For she is a treasure unto men that never fail-eth, which they that use enter into friendship with GOD, being commended from the gifts that come from learning.

At any rate these words may be honestly applied to the Church of England. No soldier likes to let the reputation of his regiment go down, but seeks rather by noble deeds to keep it fresh. Let likewise no officers do anything to tarnish the reputation of that regiment of the Catholic Church to which he belongs. So long as the learning of English-speaking priests shall still continue to be *stupor mundi*, the colors of the Church need never be lowered, and of her shall it be said, GOD helping her, as it was of Athanasius, that undaunted Father :

*Ecclesia Anglicana contra mundum.*

ARTHUR LOWNDES.

## The Decay of Rural Life in New England.

PROFESSOR SUMNER, of Yale College, in a recent article in the *Popular Science Monthly* treats in a most suggestive and interesting way that vital subject which is before us all to-day—"What makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer?" American political economy has been waiting for some one to appear who would be qualified both by theoretical knowledge and practical experience to meet this vexing problem of the extremes of progress and poverty with the solid reasoning of the principle *post hoc, not propter hoc*.

"It is an axiom of Karl Marx" Professor Sumner declares, "that as one accumulation of wealth at one pole of society indicates an accumulation of misery and overwork at the other." "In this assertion" continues Professor Sumner "Marx avoids the very common and mischievous fallacy of confusing causes, consequences and symptoms. He suggests that which is found at one pole indicates or is a symptom of what may be found at the other." And then instead of saying that the poor are poor because the rich are richer, he lays down as the fundamental principle of his argument, the following proposition:

It is the tendency of ALL SOCIAL BURDENS to *crush out the middle class*, and to force the society into an organisation of only two classes, one at each social extreme.

Professor Sumner then enforces this position by a series of pertinent historical illustrations, such as the Roman military rule with its system of taxes. Taine's description of the suffering of the middle classes during the period of the French Revolution, the almsgiving of the Monastic order, and the excessive taxation of all Protective Governments.

He then concludes his article with the proposition that all socialistic measures may always be described as tending to make the rich richer and the poor poorer and as seeking to extinguish altogether the intervening class.

I propose in the present article to take as a practical illustration of this position of Professor Sumner's as a brief glimpse at the rural life of New England, with a study of some causes of its decay and a hint as to its future possibilities.

I make this study in the condition of modern rural New England in order to show the truthfulness of Professor Sumner's position. Let me repeat this proposition once more as the text of our present investigation: "*It is the tendency of all social burdens to crush out the middle class and to force society into an organisation of only two classes—one at each social extreme.*"

When we come to study out the history of civilization in Europe we find two elements there which are denied us in this country, the fact of a *rugged peasantry* and the perpetual presence of *strong and rival races*. The first of these acts as a moral bone dust to the soil: the second as a choice of grafts in an apple orchard.

First comes the peasant element—the fine old yeomanry of Scott's stories and Shakespeare's plays. We see the influence of this class in the history of Holland and of France.

Holland is a country which according to Hudibras

"Draws thirty feet of water."

The natives have to fight for and dyke every cubic inch of ground. Windmills do the work of steam and running brooks. The people are clean and thrifty and contented. They have been drained off by countless wars, maritime exposures, and yet they are the same Dutch to-day that they were when William the Silent led them against the invasion of the Duke of Alva, or when Van Tromp scoured the ocean as the veritable Flying Dutchman.

The same is true with reference to France. Ever since the days of the invasion of Julius Cæsar, the couplet of Mother Goose's nursery rhyme has been in order as a truth of history. When in French history has it not been true, that

The King of France with forty thousand men,  
Marched up a hill and then marched down again.

War, revolution, insurrection, conscriptions, drafts, reigns of

terror and communism. This has been the variegated pattern of French history for the last two hundred years.

Ever since Louis XIV.'s reign France has been kept shaven of her bone and sinew as a modern lawn is kept smooth by a garden mower.

Yet after two Reigns of Terror, two Empires, three Kingdoms and various Republics, young France arises to-day with debt paid, her army replenished, her tears for lost Alsace and Lorraine all wiped away, ready again to follow a Boulanger as she followed a Bonaparte on any pathway which will lead to the field of military glory.

This same principle of recuperation through a rugged peasantry is seen in Ireland to-day. Not content with the teeming population of her own poor starved soil, she has furnished this country with diggers and hewers, with servants in our kitchen and laborers on our Canals and Railroads.

England too has had her own rugged Saxon graft upon the conquering Norman aristocracy. Deep in the heart of every election borough this aboriginal yeomanry is found. No doubt it is often ignorant, brutal and superstitious, but it is strong-hearted and strong-handed and it "works" into the complex pattern of English social life.

But our country does not possess this yeoman element. It stands to-day free from the weakening element of slavery, but it has a great work before it to outgrow its influence and find a healthful substitute for it. Greece, Rome, and the Italian Republics of the Middle Ages supplied the absence of peasantry with the *Helôl*-class, serf or slave in fact or in name. We have no *Helôl*-class.

Moreover our republic is not surrounded by strong and combative nationalities.

The Monroe doctrine quietly removes from our shores all strong neighbors by its radical prohibition of strong neighbors. There are no rival races bounding us in on every side and coming about us, in the words of the psalmist, as fire among thorns.

The Red-man is dying out by our worrying policy conducted through a century of dishonor. The rule of the British in India, as it culminated in the impeachment of Warren

Hastings has been gentleness itself compared to our persistent maltreatment of the original possessor of this soil. As a nation we must yet square our account some day in the future with the record awaiting us on the Almighty book of Judgment.

Then there is the negro race. To be sure the negro is reconstructed. The old slavery problem is settled. But we may have our own private speculations as to what will eventually become of this race. It is a tender, emotional race, living rather on the superficial than the real outlook of things. It remains to be seen how the creeping vine will stand when the trellis is taken away.

The Chinaman too, is here as a foreign race. He has had rather heroic treatment from us thus far. Let us trust we may never be paid back in similar currency.

Such are the nationalities around us. Who are our neighbors?

Colonial Canada comes forth with quite an open door for speculation as to her future. Then there is the Empire of Russia across the Straits from Alaska. After these come the quarrelsome republics of South America. When we look at them throwing away their energies in their chronic civil wars the same feeling comes over our minds in a larger and political way which the author of *Pilgrims Progress* had when on seeing a drunken beggar, he exclaimed "their goes John Bunyan but for the grace of GOD." We feel towards them as the Jews feel towards all the inhabitants of the land. They are only there because Providence has in some strange way overlooked them; but we, after all, are *the* people and can scarcely afford troubling ourselves very much about these creatures who are to die off on any hypothesis before long.

Mexico too, has been our Philistine, over which in triumph we have cast out our shoe. It has been our military parade ground, and has been to West Point what a Colored Mission was to a certain Divinity School as described by a negro church official: "A fine practising place for the fine young white gentlemen."

Such then is the internal condition of our country. These are the races and the neighbors which are around us. Peasantry

we have none; strong rival nationalities around us are unknown. What now do we begin to see?

The utter decline of rural life in New England. Is it possible we ask? Can it be? Let us study it out a little more closely.

New England is not the oldest of our settlements in point of time, but because of its thoroughness and compactness and formative influence in our national life. The "East" has come to be recognised as the old country of America, and as the "Fatherland" of the nation. The homesick emigrant never looked over the ocean towards his country and fatherland more intently than the cultured man of maturity when the money is made, and the hours for reflection have arrived, craves to go back again to his Eastern home.

There are three causes at present at work which are strewing their influence in the threatened decline in the rural life of New England to-day. There are

I. The Western fever.

II. The American ambition to rise.

III. The defiance of the laws of health in farm life.

The Western desire, stimulated by the advice of Horace Greely to find an outlet for restrained energies in the new West, removes by instalments, whole generations of the young men of New England. In many places in the very heart of Massachusetts, it is as it was in Eden when we read that "there was not a man to till the ground." Thirty miles inward from Worcester, the "heart of the Commonwealth," there are whole acres, which sixty years ago, sold for \$22 an acre, now selling for \$11 an acre, though railroads and telegraphs skirt the fields, and the fields themselves are excellent farm land. You find here old men and hired farm laborers, Irish, Canadian French and nondescript help, but *no yeomanry indigenous to the soil.*

The young men have all gone West impelled by various causes. Portsmouth, Newburyport, Bristol, Stonington, Nantucket, New Bedford, are already like the finished towns of the old world. In religious matters, Maine, New Hampshire, and parts of Massachusetts are like mission fields at the West. To be successfully served with the Gospel the day is coming when

the decayed and feeble parish organisations in rural districts must yield before the stronger and more helpful method of the missionary circuit. Even the literary headship of Boston is a souvenir of the past. The financial attractions of the great metropolis are simply irresistible.

The American ambition to rise is the second cause assigned. Of course this may be all wrong, and some one else may set us right. But after looking at the subject carefully over, the rides and fishing excursions of a long drive through Western Massachusetts it seems as if the reasons assigned for the present decay of New England's rural life were not far astray. I came across a farmer this Summer who was rendered unhappy not because of worms or potato bugs, but because his daughter was not a school-mistress and his son failed in the election of "County Supervisor."

I have in mind now a certain farm kitchen "help" who on being asked her religious convictions replied that she had none whatever, but went wherever they had "liberal ideas and smart preaching."

It is this hand over hand rise into social position, and self-made riches, a tendency which the thousands of subscription books about the great self-made men of America circulated from door to door is constantly stimulating, which begets dissatisfaction and exalts the most pernicious kind of ambition. Young men prefer to become book agents, drummers, or brakemen on a train, to doing a day's work in the fields, and American girls will starve over a hard feeding sewing machine day and night, or become clerks, and telephone operators before they will do woman's work in farm service.

One other cause is given for the present decay in the rural life of New England, viz: the defiance of the laws of health. A philosophical farmer friend, who is a business man in Boston half the year and a farmer the other half, a gentleman who raises the finest stock and looks broadly and in the light of blood and heredity upon the problems of humanity, just as he looks at cause and effect in his colts and his heifers, has recently posted me with some alarming statistics on this important subject. He lives in a proverbially dry and healthful section of Massachusetts, but a place where the country people

die rapidly and regularly by consumption. First the health is broken by dyspepsia, then cold sets in and consumption follows on the wasted frame. My farmer friend says his horses would die in the same way if they ate correspondingly poor food and slept in the same vitiated atmosphere.

Three or four girls will sleep in one room together with window down and door shut. The boys of the family do the same down stairs on the ground floor—near the odors of the kitchen. Regular airing of the house there is none. The frying pan is used at every meal. Pie at breakfast, doughnuts and pie sent off to the "hands" in the field for dinner, and a greasy hot fry for supper is the daily bill of fare. The delights of the French stew, economical, healthful and savory are unknown.

Then comes a gone feeling; dyspepsia follows: wild and indiscriminate dosings with quack medicines freely advertised in the weekly paper and easily obtained at the rival drug stores in the village—aggravate the disease; decline follows and consumption at last claims the miserable victim.

My friend suggests that if some of the medical faculty could make an annual health crusade through the rural towns of New England in the interests of fresh air, wholesome living and *abstinence from quack medicines* they would be accomplishing more good than the wild excesses of Prohibition lecturers and Temperance advocates. Many a reformed drunkard falls back upon some strong blood purifier until the poisonous drug completes the wreck which the injurious alcohol had begun.

Sidney Smith once said of a certain friend, "He has not body enough to cover his mind; his intellect is exposed." We have several meetings, and temperance rallies and political stump orations for the masses. If the mind of rural New England is not decently covered with body, cannot the medical faculty come to her help to-day?

There is one other reason which must be given for the decay of the rural life in New England. It is the burden of taxation on farm lands, which coming upon a reduced standard of living, drives the young and the indigent to seek some simpler method of earning a livelihood, than the hazardous life of working all one's energies merely to pay the taxes for land

which is not produceable. A carpet bag; a convenient train; a Western town; these cannot be resisted, and so the old homestead is deserted for the sake of ready money in a handy pocketbook. Such are a few thoughts suggested by the subject of the rural life of New England in its present aspect of decay. What now are its future possibilities?

Let us go back to Prof. Sumner's proposition once more.

It is the tendency, he says, of all social burdens to crush out the middle class and to force the society into an organisation of only two classes one at each social extreme.

That these farms will be re-peopled; that rural New England will be quick with life again, no one can doubt who has made a study of their present changing condition.

All through the deserted mill towns of Western Massachusetts, along those slopes where the little hamlets suggest Swiss and Tyrolese towns, a new class of tenantry is making itself conspicuous. We pause a moment to ask if it can be true, and if this is the race which is to succeed us, and then we remember its strength of stock and its persistent grasp of the soil, and we salute the coming race of New England farmers in the Irish-American tenant of to-day.

Rural New England has had her traditions, but her bone and sinew have gone forth from her homesteads to people the far West and these American born children of Irish parents with fresh recruits from Ireland to-day are elements which are to be woven into the problem of the future possibilities of our rural New England life.

But it is the unexpected which is continually happening. The sea-shore and the hill country of New England are being sought by thousands of tired people from the Middle States and the great West during the Summer months, and rural home life as the ideal home life is making itself felt with us to-day, as it has made itself long ago felt in the rural home life of England.

A backward waver of returning love for rural life is striking New England at the present time. Here is another possibility for her future. Let us hope it is one which will not make the rich richer, or the poor poorer, but will recreate that lost

372 *The Decay of Rural Life in New England.*

type in American society, the intelligent farmer—let us trust that he will be the coming man—a man, who farms because he learned to like the work, and because he is intelligent; one who has found out that far-off lesson, that working the soil is the first use that GOD ever made of man.

REV. WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON.

## Are Parochial Missions Valuable Aids to the Material and Spiritual Growth of Church Life? and How Ought They to be Conducted?

**M**ATERIAL growth of Church Life is not an object at which Parochial Missions aim. They are based upon the fact, which would seem to be undeniable, that all healthy material growth must come from preceding spiritual activity and progress. It is this latter which the movement toward Parochial Missions has constantly in view.

The tendency of all forms of thought and action is to settle into approved methods, and to overlook, or even to deny all demand for variety or change. The excellence of the method adopted very frequently intensifies this tendency. It is visible in all religious systems, when most properly novelty in itself is most distasteful. And yet new demands are constantly arising, new conditions are created, and new individuals feel estranged from methods of religious life which are most excellently suited to those who have been instrumental in determining their form. The Parochial Mission furnishes an opportunity for reviving the conception and the reality of the Church's universal mission, without interfering with its well regulated movement on ordinary occasions.

In such a Mission the dwelling upon fundamental truths of spiritual religion renews the clear sense of the object of all religious institutions and doctrines; a new impulse is given to the Christian life which minister and people alike feel, and in which their oneness of experience is of great value; the sound of a new voice breaks up that thinking in one channel which the continued ministry of one man must engender; the temporary use of new methods shows the readiness and desire of the Church to reach men in every way; the freedom of the

Missioner, who comes as a stranger and without the knowledge of individuals and of peculiar circumstances of Parish life, enables him to speak with a plainness which frequently cannot be used in more settled relations; the work of preparation for a Mission awakens to a sense of individual duty many who have become accustomed to see with tranquility the more constant systems of work carried on by others; the interest excited in the community gives a currency to religious conversation and discussion, which is foreign to the ordinary tendency of men's minds upon subjects of deepest personal import. All of these advantages are presumably guided and regulated by a Missioner who is familiar with the work and understands its dangers and how they can best be avoided. It is difficult to see what system could more safely be made use of to overcome the tendencies which routine and prescribed methods, however good and wise they may be, must develop in human action.

In regard to the working power of the Church the Parochial Mission gives the opportunity of testing new methods and of developing new instrumentalities which subsequently, and with such modifications as are demanded, can be incorporated in Church life. The irregularity of the occasion marks certain methods as not belonging to the regular action of the Church while suggesting material for improvement and addition in such action. In this way the use of extemporaneous prayer cultivates in clergy and laity the sense that the Church has not lost the power or duty of contributing to the resources of prayer in the Church, as well as of using what past ages have left us. The use of special hymns results in a knowledge of those which are best adapted for incorporation in the Church's hymnal. The acquaintance which is gained with the religious aptitudes and desires of individuals and classes dictates new modes of organisation in Parish work. It is the strongest Parish which is best suited to have a Mission, and this fact shows that it is no desperate remedy, but one which simply supplies that want of new movement which is constantly felt, but is so difficult if not impossible to meet in ordinary methods. A Parish may not gain great accessions from the outside by means of a Mission; whether it does so or not must be largely determined by its position and character; but the increase of spiritual life among

its members extends its ability and readiness to reach those who have long had but the slightest relation to the interests of the spiritual life.

A Mission is a time of special prayer and work for one great object, deeper spiritual life within and without the Church. And in this light it is difficult to see how there can be doubt of its beneficial influence upon the spiritual growth of a Church. It holds the same relation to ordinary seasons which Lent does to the other parts of the year. Within the year the need of a special season is recognised, and the principle is thus admitted, by reason of which special years in a Church's life shall be times of new consecration and activity. In all Christian bodies such a need has made itself felt. Our system, which is at once one of freedom and of order, makes it possible to supply that need with less inconveniences than have attended other similar efforts. We cannot avoid a commonly felt need, whereas we can use our opportunities for meeting it rightly.

The method of Parochial Missions in this country will certainly be modified as circumstances dictate, and must ultimately differ widely from English patterns; and yet the kinship and similarity of the two peoples will make all experience gained on the other side of the water of great value. That Missions should not be too frequent in any Parish, lest they should interfere with the ordinary current of Parish life or be constantly anticipated as occasions for making up delinquencies, that thorough previous preparation is necessary, that subsequent well organised work should always be their result, that the spirit of prayer should be the prominent one in preparing for or conducting a Mission, that the Missioner should be one as little as possible connected with the Parish before or after a Mission, these are features of Mission work which experience has proved to be almost invariable. Details must be determined by the Parish and the Mission preacher, and will constantly vary. But that the Missioner should be a parish minister, even though for a limited time he may devote himself especially to the work of Parochial Missions seems to be becoming more and more the conviction of those interested in the work. So only is the work as well as the worker kept in a healthy mental and spiritual condition. The danger of routine is

largely avoided, the Missions are kept in relation to the ordinary life of the Church, practical wisdom enters into methods of teaching, and sympathy with Rector and people in their Parish life is fully maintained. Nothing seems to promise that the growth of a class of professed missionaries would be of advantage to the Church.

As a movement I believe that Parochial Missions have already bestowed upon the Church great benefits, which could have been gained in no other way, and that with the sympathy and wise guidance which they deserve they are destined to do yet more for its spiritual, which must ever be its best interests.

ARTHUR BROOKS.

---

IT would seem more fitting that testimony as to the value of Parochial Missions should be borne by Pastors in whose Parish such missions have been held rather than by those who more especially give themselves to the work of Mission Priests. Confining myself, therefore, to the second part of the subject proposed for discussion, I will venture to contribute a few suggestions, the result of experience in England, the States and Canada, as to the way in which Parochial Missions should, and should not be conducted. It may, perhaps, be more convenient to state the suggestions in the way of protests against misconceptions that are not uncommon. But first let the idea of a Parochial Mission be clearly understood. It is—as here considered—a special effort made in an already existing Parish, lasting during a limited period (not less than twelve days), and intended to build up the Parish in its life and work, to deepen the spiritual life of its individual members, and to draw other persons in the town or neighborhood within hearing of the Gospel, that they also may become partakers of the spiritual blessings held out to them in the Church of CHRIST. A Mission is a concentration of spiritual force upon a certain place for a given period.

1. A Mission, therefore, must never be regarded as a substitute for faithful pastoral work. The most successful Missions have been those held in parishes on which the most faithful and laborious pastoral care had been for a long time expended.

It is when the parish priest has done his best and his utmost that he should call in the assistance of Mission Priests to supplement his work.

The short pastorates so common in this country make the expediency of Parochial Missions very doubtful in many places. I have in more than one or two cases been invited to preach a Mission in a parish which a few months later the Rector had himself abandoned.

A successful Mission will require much careful preparation on the part of the Rector beforehand, and will leave him with greatly increased responsibilities.

2. A Mission is sometimes planned in which a number of different preachers are to take part; the idea apparently being that because in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, the Word will be much more efficacious when uttered by half a dozen different preachers. But this is a point where experience must be allowed some weight, and the verdict of experience will without a doubt decide in favor of *concentration*. The great company of preachers, while ministering to itching ears and suggesting comparison and criticism, will lack that continuity both in teaching and in influence which contributes very largely to the effectiveness of Mission and other preaching.

Persons have been touched, stirred, won by one preacher and will be ready and eager to hear more from him, but his influence he cannot quickly transfer to another man of very different, though they may be equal or superior, gifts. A certain intellectual and spiritual relationship has been established between preacher and hearers, which it is of the utmost importance not to throw away. For this reason it is better that where more than one Mission Priest is employed (as will in a large church be always desirable) *courses* of sermons and instructions should be assigned to each.

3. In a Mission mere preaching without individual ministration will accomplish comparatively little. Persons have their own individual needs, temptations, sorrows, difficulties, and require individual help.

The Missioner must be free, and ready to receive for personal counsel and help those who have been moved by his

public utterances. In many cases they can be referred to their ordinary pastors; but oftentimes, as will be at once understood, an enquirer or a penitent will feel less constrained in unburdening himself to a comparative stranger than to one with whom he is in frequent social intercourse. Perhaps the Mission Priest has from the pulpit spoken home to his conscience or thrown light on some perplexity. He, it is felt, can understand the case.

4. In this individual work, as in his public administrations, the Mission Priest must be allowed a free hand—to deal with those who seek his help in the way which to them seems best.

A Mission hampered by restrictions as to Confession is in my opinion almost useless. Some persons will be burdened with a sense of sin, and their need will be Confession; others will be seeking advice as to meeting temptation, or the ordering of their life. . . . It should be distinctly understood by all from the beginning that in inviting persons to individual conferences no obligation of Confession is intended, while on the other hand any who desire this help are entirely free to seek it.

Perfect frankness and a simple explanation will anticipate and brush away many prejudices and difficulties. In his public teaching the Missioner, if he is a man of sense and tact, will naturally take into account the circumstances and character of the congregation and adapt himself thereto, not putting strong meat before babes, nor endangering solid gain for the sake of a word or phrase likely to be misunderstood.

The Missioner and the Parish Priest must, of course, be in hearty sympathy and accord. There must be mutual confidence between the two. Nothing will be done by the Mission Priest without the concurrence of the Rector, and the Rector, having chosen his Missioner, will if wise, take care not to hamper him in his work.

5. The very idea of a Mission being that of an exceptional effort, great *elasticity* of method should be allowed.

This will be necessary.

(1). In departing from the ordinary stated service of the Church. A Mission is to win people to take their part in these, or to do so better. During the time of the Mission the Pulpit

will be more prominent than the Altar ; preaching will precede prayer ; GOD'S word will be first proclaimed, and then souls led to Him in supplication, confession and dedication.

*Extempore* prayer of the simplest kind will often be found most suitable ; and, where this might be thought objectionable, anyone who is thoroughly familiar with the Prayer Book, and who knows how to use its material apart from the ordinary context will seldom be at a loss for appropriate prayers.

(2). Elasticity is not less necessary in providing for different classes and sets of people, arranging appropriate services and instructions at suitable hours for each.

Special address to Men, to Mothers, to the Young of either sex, are of the greatest value.

(3). At the same time the exercises of the Mission must be adapted to the actual needs and possibilities of the particular place. There must be no servile and unreasoning imitation of exercises and methods found useful and successful under other and different circumstances.

After the General Mission in New York, three years ago, there was for a time a danger of Missions becoming fashionable, and quite a number of applications were received, some of them from small country places, in which special stress was laid on a midday conference to men after the fashion of those given at Trinity Church, New York. Grace does not supersede common sense.

ARTHUR C. A. HALL.

---

SOME fifty years ago the *Presbyterian* Church in this country was confronted with the question of "*Revivals*." That was the name then by which the thing now known as "*Missions*," was called. The thing came from the movement which produced Methodism and the "*Evangelical*" movement in our Church.

The Presbyterians up to that time had not been given to cultivating the emotions, and had been strong in the way of theological training and in cultivating tenderness of conscience. They resisted with all their might the new fangled methods. Their conservative spirit felt that the spread of the new method would be attended by decadence in intelligent grasp

of doctrine and in conscientious training. At the same time they felt a fear "lest haply they might be found fighting against God." They were, therefore, overcome, and "Revivalism" became an acknowledged part of the machinery "in aid of the material and spiritual growth of Church life."

The event has proven, to my mind at least, that their instinct was right, and that the adoption of the system has been predominantly evil. Revulsion from it, and disgust with the results of it have been the cause of more accessions to our Church in the last thirty years than all other causes combined.

Now the same method asks for admission at the door of our own Church. That it *is* the same is perfectly plain to any one who has watched them both in operation—as I have. The differences are only accidental, the identity is in substance. It is "an auld sang to a new lilt." The "Revival" sings Moody and Sanky's maudlin songs of experience; the "Mission" sings erotic hymns of religious emotion. The sober psalmody of Presbyterianism and the sober hymnody of the Church are alike discarded, because they are alike unsuited to the purpose in view which is to stimulate the emotions, and through this stimulation to secure righteousness of life.

That there is a good side to it is evident. Its great attraction is that it seems to promise quick results. Drafts upon the emotions are quickly paid, but the result of the process where it has long been continued has been to debaseth the spiritual currency. The Church is better able to endure the evil than any other. Her system of persistent and methodical training of the understanding and the conscience will be able to preserve her for a long time from the evils which have elsewhere followed upon the other method; but not for always. Meanwhile, earnest minded Christian men of other names look on with something of amazement and much of regret, when they see the Church about to adopt a weapon which has been in so many cases, discredited, and in so many, discarded.

No one can deny that the plan has been in cases productive of good results. In Parishes where the Rector possesses in himself the qualities of a good "Missioner" the results have

been good—and would show themselves whether the formal machinery of a "Mission" had been set up or not. But how many cases can be found where the Rector of a Parish has had even a successful Mission conducted by a stranger, who wants it done a second time?

For myself I feel bound for the spiritual advancement of my own people. I am bound to suppose that if I cannot effect it nobody can.

While I would not put a straw in the way of my neighbor who wants a "Mission," I would not have one on any terms. Coleridge was once asked if he believed in ghosts? "No," said he, "I have seen too many of them."

---

S. D. McCONNEL.

I AM asked to say a word on the present subject in the symposium conducted by the Editor of the REVIEW, and my communication shall be brief and to the point.

I. In reply to the question "Are Parochial Missions Valuable Aids to the Growth of Church Life?" I would say:

"It all depends" upon the Missions. I have seen Missions which have been good—Missions which have been bad—and Missions which have been indifferent.

Twice in my parish life and experience I have had successful Missions, and in each case the success of the Mission was the direct result of the character of the Missioner—the Rev. Algernon S. Crapsey.

II. In reply to the second question, "How Ought Missions to be Conducted?" I would say: This is a matter for the Rector of the Parish to decide.

III. I believe in Missions when there is a character and a personality back of the Missioner. I do not believe in Missions as a catch-all for Confirmation, or as the product of a Mission Society.

Missioners must be born, not made. They must be men from GOD, not men from societies. The whole conception of successful Mission work lies in the principle of voluntariness, in the prophetic idea, not in the priestly or ecclesiastical idea. John the Baptist was a Missioner in the Wilderness. His father Zacharias, was a priest in the Temple. There is a place for the

priesthood in the Christian system, but the Missioner to be successful must be for the time a voice in the Wilderness—not a priest in the Temple.

Moreover, to be successful, the Missioner must not be a professional. He must touch life on all its sides, not on one side only. The successful parish Missioner who has the "gift of witnessing," who leaves his parish for a Mission and goes back again when the Mission is over, is the most successful Missioner. He acquires in this way the sound judgment of the practical man of affairs and avoids the crankery and oddity and expert narrowness of the professional Missioner.

Rev. Edward Everett Hale said some time ago that every professional man needed a vocation and an avocation, the one to lead him into his profession, and the other to lead him out of it. He said, moreover, that many a man was better known by his avocation than he was by his vocation—because his temperament carried him on the one line and his professional routine on the other.

To conclude, therefore, I would say that to my mind the success of a practical Mission depends entirely upon the character of the Missioner, and the success of the Missioner depends upon his being a born Missioner and not a manufactured one; and whose vocation is "the parish priest," and whose avocation is "the witnessing prophet."

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE NEWTON.

---

THE history and experience of our New York Advent Mission, and of the Parochial Missions Society for the past three years, evinces beyond a doubt the need and value of Parochial Missions.

Evangelistic efforts are no new thing in the Church. The only question is, how to conduct a Mission so that unreal exaggerations shall be eliminated, while healthy interest, with the healthy excitement that always accompanies real interest, is stimulated.

Eighteen hundred years ago the Founder of Christianity under guise of a parable, drew this remarkable, prophetic picture of the future history of His Church:

A certain man made a great supper and bade many. And they all with one consent began to make excuse. \* \* \* Then the Master of the house being angry, said to His servant: Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city, and bring in hither the poor, and the maimed, and the halt, and the blind. The servant said: Lord, it is done as thou hast commanded, and yet there is room. And the Lord said: Go out into the highways and the hedges and compel them to come in, that My house may be filled; for I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden shall taste of My supper.

This parable, uttered before the Church was born, reveals how searching was His knowledge of human nature who "knew all that was in man." It portrays the opposing influences with which the Church has had to contend in the after ages of Christendom, and holds up a vivid picture of realities, only too sadly familiar to the experience of every one who knows the inner history of parish life.

In some country village, through the earnest, self-denying efforts of a devout missionary, with his little band of lay helpers at his side, a Church is founded. As the spire slowly rises above the tops of the houses, pointing the way to heaven, the people seem thankful, interested and fervent in their expressions of sympathy. Prayerfully and earnestly the workers persevere, cheered by hope, and stimulated by the thought that the day is at hand when a spiritual home will be provided for every child of GOD in the place. At last "all things are ready"—the door stands wide open, the beautiful Prayer Book services are begun, the invitation goes forth Sunday after Sunday. But the children, where are they? In reply to the kindly words of welcome from the lips of minister and congregation, "They all with one consent begin to make excuse."

Shift the scene to another part of the land, to an older parish in a more thickly settled community, or to one of the great metropolitan churches of the crowded city, and the sight repeats itself. The experience of one is the experience of all.

Our parish churches gather in but a few earnest souls—a mere handful out of the teeming myriads. The same faces are

to be seen in the same places Sunday after Sunday, and year after year. The parish quietly pursues the even tenor of its way. Little groups of church workers methodically attend their various meetings. A little band of Sunday-school children gathers for spiritual instruction once a week. The Rector goes on his round of pastoral visits and preaches his Sunday sermons. The services follow one another with orderly precision. The sexton locks the Church door at the close of each, and the vestry and pew-holders congratulate one another that their Church is paying its way and is in so healthy a condition. How about the masses that throng the streets, that pass by the Church door, that live out their lives with no other religious influence to stir their hearts than the sound of a church bell from a neighboring spire? How about the business men who scoff at and criticise the handful of Church goers? And the people of fashion from whose world GOD is excluded, and the tradesmen who are alienated in heart from CHRIST, and the tenement house population whose darkened lives are unilluminated by one ray of the Sun of Righteousness, whose joyless hearts are uncheered by one smile of Christian sympathy?

Do not minister and people think of *these* amid their selfish worship, Sunday after Sunday, in their pleasant parish Church, with its stained glass windows and its comfortable pews? Ah, yes, but alas! they have lost their first energy and enthusiasm. *Once* they endeavored to reach and bring in these classes, but when they found the difficulties in the way their missionary zeal evaporated; it is useless, they will tell you, to make the attempt, and so they have given up trying. Did not our LORD himself say, "Many are called, but few are chosen?" The Church Service, which is so helpful and so devotional to the spiritually-minded few, is not adapted to the outlying masses. And so the congregation settles down into a comfortable, utterly selfish, unchristian kind of Christianity, and dies by inches of respectability.

Is, then, our orderly service, with its common prayer and common praise, a kind of worship that does not meet and satisfy the ordinary spiritual needs of humanity? Is this the stern and unwelcome logic of facts?

No, the difficulty is not here. Our Prayer Book worship has been the gradual growth of centuries. Its services are the fruit of the experience of many generations of Christians; and here in America, where every kind of religious method has been earnestly and conscientiously followed by various denominations of Christians, there is a very marked gravitation toward liturgical forms, and an increasing conviction that nothing can take their place in public worship or in ministering to the spiritual wants of human souls. Moreover, it is not our own Church alone which fails to reach the masses. These other Christian bodies which have freer forms of worship betray a similar tendency to settle down into a cast-iron conservatism, evincing the same inability to reach the masses, the same narrow spirit of exclusiveness and selfish parochialism that we view among ourselves.

The majority of Church-goers do not, indeed, recognise these evils. It is easy to grow accustomed to any state of things. Few men take the trouble to think, and fewer still have the healthy spiritual instinct to recognize a moral wrong to which the community in which they live is blind. There are no influences so hard to overcome as those of class bias and class prejudice; yet when we contrast prevailing types of Christianity with the fresh teachings of CHRIST and the gospel portraiture of the early Church, there is plainly something lacking in our ordinary parish life. Some different agency is evidently needed to overcome this mysterious force of inertia, the tendency of which is to paralyze healthy spiritual effort, and to substitute the spirit of religious selfishness for that of religious self-denial in Churches as well as individuals.

The problem is, how shall that wrong be righted? Men answer, through personal influence; no forms or ceremonies can take the place of personal religious influence. Yes; but how are you to get our modern Christians to *use* their personal influence? They care only for their own religious needs; they are so sunk in worldliness that they have no desire to bless others or to convert the world. Perhaps we may here learn a lesson from the past.

As we trace back, from century to century, we discover that this is no new condition of religious life due to the pecu-

liar circumstances of the nineteenth century. It is but a repetition in a new phase of an old difficulty that has always manifested itself in the history of the Church. And the providential way of counteracting this tendency to degenerate has ever been a succession of religious reformations or revivals, in which the servants of GOD ceased striving with those who all with one consent began to make excuse, and went out into the streets and lanes of the city, the highways and hedges of the country, to reach and convert the masses.

At various times in the past GOD thus raised up different spiritual leaders to quicken the higher life in the souls of men.

It was thus in the eleventh century that Peter the Hermit preached the first crusade. It was thus that S. Francis of Assisi, Peter Waldo and John Wickliffe led hundreds of thousands to the feet of CHRIST in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It was thus, at a later period, that Martin Luther and Savonarola, Calvin and Zwingli, Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley kindled the fires of the Great Reformation. It was thus that Molinos and Fenelon, S. Francis de Sales and John Bunyan arose in a subsequent era to be beacon lights to the age in which they lived; and so on down to the present time.

When the Church of England was in danger of substituting outward forms for inward life, the Puritans arose to combat the influences of their day; when it settled down into an unspiritual state, and its greatest leaders were bandying words in useless dogmatic controversies about predestination and free will, George Fox drew the earnest-hearted into the fields after him, exclaiming: "I believe in the HOLY GHOST." When it was honey-combed with worldliness, and its highest offices were political prizes bestowed upon royal favorites, John Wesley was sent to tell that no man could serve the LORD CHRIST without conversion and a change of heart.

In days gone by these earnest-hearted men were driven from the bosom of the Church. They were treated as the prophets and wise men were, and as the great preacher, John the Baptist, was in the olden Jewish times. The Church saw not that these were the leaders whom GOD raised up to save

her from destruction. Because they obeyed CHRIST'S command, and leaving those who all "with one consent began to make excuse," they thus went out "into the streets and lanes of the city, into the highways and hedges," to preach the Gospel to the poor, the maimed, the halt and the blind; they were distrusted and scorned and persecuted by the Christians of their day.

But the Church is wiser now. Reading her life lessons from the past, she beholds that in her life she has ever been most blessed by the efforts of those whom she has most reviled; and to-day she not only strives to retain such lion-hearted reformers within her fold, but endeavors also to make room for their methods in her system of work and worship.

Many of these revivals have indeed been accompanied with recognized evils. And here in America we are familiar enough with the emotionalism, the untrue conceptions of conversion and of the spiritual life which seem inseparable from all such movements. Yet, on the other hand, gazing back upon the history of the past, we find, as we have said, that from the days in which S. John the Baptist preached repentance in the wilderness down to the present time this is one of the forces which Providence persistently uses in overcoming the inertia and tendency to degenerate into worldliness which is visible in all ages of the Church.

The question is, how to welcome and utilise such movements without falling into the exaggerations and the reactions which so plainly are connected with them.

It seems to have been the peculiar office of our Church to be able, with her Apostolic order, trained judgment and disciplined life, so to make room for these and other spiritual agencies that, as far as possible, the emotionalism shall be controlled, the exaggerations toned down, and the reactions avoided.

As she has made a legitimate place for religious brotherhoods and sisterhoods, under such safeguards as will protect them from the recognised dangers of conventional life; as she has opened her doors for a more elaborate ritual than many of her people care for or are in sympathy with, without commit-

ting herself to the kind of doctrine which she holds to be alien to the spirit of Christianity; as she has stretched out her arms to welcome all that is good in distinctively denominational life; as she has stripped the temperance cause of the fanaticism that has heretofore been identified with it, and placed it upon a sound and rational basis; as she has made room in her services for Protestant prayer meetings and extemporaneous forms of worship, so has she met another long felt want of human nature by substituting her earnest, practical "Mission" for the popular, spasmodic "Revival."

A Parochial Mission is simply a series of services held continuously for ten days or two weeks in a parish Church and elsewhere, conducted by a Missioner or evangelist, who by long experience and natural gifts has peculiar qualifications for this work, and who has been invited by the Rector to assume the charge of all the services for this given time.

The *object* of the Mission is so to localise and concentrate the efforts of the parish that, while the spiritual life of the parishioners is deepened by the very effort to bless others, the careless and indifferent are led to realise the presence of GOD and to see themselves as GOD sees them.

The *value* of a Mission consists in its unexpectedness. It is not another Lent, nor does it in any way take the place of Lent. Just because it is out of the routine, and forms no part of the Church's regular system, its appeal to all hearts is all the more powerful. Why this is it is hard to say, but that it *is* so experience abundantly proves.

The *work* of the mission divides itself into three parts, which are so closely correlated that each is dependent upon the thoroughness with which that which has preceded it has been done.

First comes the *preparatory* work of interesting the public and creating public opinion, of using personal influence with all classes to attend the mission services, of going out into the streets and lanes of the city, into the highways and hedges, and endeavoring by all quiet and rational means to bring men back to their GOD.

Then follows the work *during the mission*, which, as we have said, is the prayerful effort by hearty devotional services

and simple, straightforward preaching to reach all classes, and bring the truth of CHRIST straight home to human hearts.

Then, when the Mission is ended, comes the all-important *after-work* of holding those who have been influenced by the services—helping them to form religious habits, and getting them, for their own sakes as well as for the sake of others, to do some work for GOD.

Now, observe, this is no new movement. It is hard to trace the history of Parochial Missions. Some say that they originated in France, some in America, some in England. The probability is that we can point to no particular time or place in which the Mission was first started. It seems to have been a gradual growth, and the form in which it now appears is probably the result of long and accumulated experience. Many, many years ago Parochial Missions were tentatively tried in various parishes in England, and the result in every case where the plan was properly worked was so blessed that at last it was decided to have a general mission in the City of London. This was in the year 1869. We know the cast-iron conservatism of the English people. The movement at first evoked great suspicion; it was regarded as something entirely alien to the spirit of the Episcopal Church. All sorts of objections were made to it, but in the end this new venture of faith triumphed, and about one hundred and twenty parishes took part in it. The experiment was attended with such success, and the permanent blessing which followed it was so great, that five years later the proposal to hold a fresh mission received the official sanction and blessing of the three bishops in whose dioceses the City of London was at that time situated—the Bishops of London, Winchester and Rochester.

Finally, after a lapse of ten years more, it was felt that the time had come for a third mission in the metropolitan city of England. Under the auspices of the late Bishop of London it was arranged, and during the winter, amid signal blessings, it was held in over three hundred churches.

All this while the earnest, steady prosecution of evangelistic work has been going on in all parts of England side by side

with parish work, and the result is not only that the "Mission" has become a universally recognised agency in the system of the English Church, and that a trained company of experienced missionaries is taking its place beside the parochial clergy, but that through the combined efforts of pastors and evangelists there has been manifested in the past ten or fifteen years a general elevation of the tone of spiritual life and a marked deepening of religious character throughout the whole Church of England.

Now, it must not be forgotten that *we* are in America, and not in England; and nothing is clearer than that the character of the American people, as it has been moulded by our free institutions, is different from that of the English nation; nor can we expect that many flowers which bloom and blossom in the British Isles will be anything but exotics here; but there are some plants which are at home in every clime, and this evangelistic work seems to be a branch of our FATHER'S own planting. We have seen that there has been a call for and need of evangelists as well as pastors, prophets as well as priests, in all ages of the world, and the chief objection against Parochial Missions which will be raised here is not that they are of English origin, but that they present too close an approximation to the American revival system.

Those of us who believe that this work is of GOD, and who after praying for and preparing to take part in the General Mission which was held in this city in the recent Advent season, must be prepared to face criticism. A fresh venture of faith always evokes criticism—the criticism of those conservative persons who can see no good in any instrumentalities save those with which they are familiar; the criticisms of the careless and worldly-minded, who are necessarily antagonistic to all aggressive religious effort; the one-sided criticism of those who behold only the evils that are connected with everything that is good, and which are inseparable from every progressive movement; the kindly, intelligent criticisms of those who are wont "to look before they leap," and who wisely hesitate before they commit themselves to what may be an error in judgment or action.

HENRY Y. SATTERLEE.

EVERY clergyman asks himself the question sooner or later in his ministerial work, "What can be done to supplement the ordinary ministrations, and reach two classes of persons—those who need quickening in their spiritual lives, and those who have never been awakened to newness of life in CHRIST JESUS?" He knows full well that there are men and women whom he meets daily, to whom he preaches constantly, who for years have remained as indifferent to the demands of the Gospel as though they lived in heathen lands, and were beyond the reach of Gospel ministrations. It is useless to praise the merits of the Prayer Book, or discourse eloquently upon the advantages and beauty of a liturgical service, or assert the superiority of the Church over other religious systems; the truth forces itself upon one that notwithstanding all these things, these people are uninfluenced in either the direction of holy living, or devotion to Christian work.

The other class of which we speak—those living in open sin, or if not this, actually opposing the Gospel by their indifference and unconcern, seem to demand something other than the regular methods and ministrations to awaken them out of their sleep, and force upon them the conviction that life in CHRIST is the only life eternal. Both classes therefore demand something extraordinary to reach and influence them. Thinking of these things, the clergyman who is as earnest as he is devout, will continue to search for some agency, which can be utilised to the well-being of these two classes of individuals. He will never be satisfied to say, if all that is being done fails to influence certain persons, they must remain in their sins. The meaning of "compel them to come in" will be appreciated, and besides ringing the bell and ministering to those who come to church of their own free will and accord, he will seek to inaugurate methods of work that will force the listless out of their listlessness, and make sinners see the error of their ways.

The Parochial Mission is such an agency in Church life and work. It seeks merely to reach those who are not influenced by the regular ministrations. It assumes, what everybody knows to be true, that the best things become common by frequent repetition; that the thunder

shower clears the atmosphere, where the ordinary storm cannot do it so well.

The objection that anything novel in the way of spiritual work is to be feared because likely to be erroneous, can apply only to doctrine. If anything other than the old Gospel be preached, blessings cannot follow such preaching. But no such objection can for a moment be urged against the adaptation of the Gospel to special needs, unusual surroundings, extraordinary emergencies.

The common sense that will allow a rubric to be overlooked, or even a canon to lose for the moment its binding force, when the occasion demands the breach in observance, is the common sense that will not oppose the few changes in service, and the unusual observances incident to a properly conducted mission. The thing is here, has been here as a latent force some time, is now beginning to be utilised for the welfare of the Church, the good of man, and the greater glory of GOD. Stripped of all its methods and means, in themselves of small importance, and changeable in nature, the Parochial Mission is merely a united effort on the part of priest and people to supply the need of those about them with the riches of CHRIST JESUS.

The preparation for the Mission by prayer, private and public, by extensive advertising of services and distribution of appropriate literature, by appeals from the pulpit and the press to the careless and Godless to attend the services and meetings, by house to house visitation, and any other approved methods looking to the end aimed at, is in itself a blessing to any parish. Before the Mission begins, an awakening has taken place, the revival is evident. During the progress of the services, the hospitality shown to strangers by the regular parishioners, attendance of those who do not ordinarily attend place of worship, serious interest taken in holy things by professors, and an evident concern felt by those who hitherto have passed holy things by on the other side, the children feeling that in any manifestation of GOD'S favor on a parish, they share with others the providential goodness, saying prayers together in behalf of those who seek the prayers of the faithful for their own or others needs, the hearty singing of easy and worshipful hymns, the earnest preaching of simple truths in

simple style, the conversational after-talk which aims to press home to the hearts of the hearers the truths that have been dwelt upon at length in the sermon—all these things increase the earnestness and zeal of the faithful, and bring the hitherto Godless and unconcerned to a condition of mind that the HOLY SPIRIT can operate on them with success.

The after-work of a Mission is no less fruitful in good results.

The simple device of cards distributed through the pews on the last few evenings of a Mission will secure to the Rector a large number of names and addresses of men and women who are willing to testify that the Mission has been a conscious blessing to them, and to promise that henceforth they will become soldiers of CHRIST, or else be better soldiers than ever they have been before.

Then, the distribution of these names among the several organisations of the parish, looking after the special needs of each, until as it were all have been brought to the Altar, and there receive the grace that enables them to do all such good works as GOD has prepared for them to walk in, this work will go far to give life to a parish, and make it plenteous in good deeds.

Never has there been held a Parochial Mission that has had thorough preparation, and been properly conducted by one who loved his church enough to conform to her ways wherever this could be done, but the results have been satisfactory.

The Mission has been abused by men who thought it would work miracles, who dreamed that in a week the Mission would do what they had failed to do in years, who looked to it as a last resort to float both the parish and themselves into a sea of unwonted prosperity.

The Mission has always been approved by those who went about their work in a spirit of consecration and prayer, and all through the services showed a loyalty to the Church so consistent with a quiet earnestness to do all things possible for the extension of the Redeemer's Kingdom.

I personally have found it difficult to exercise patience toward the bearing of those who think they have done their whole duty when they have rendered stated services, and

preached the Gospel to those who voluntarily have come to Church.

There is too much self-pleasing in this attitude to suit one who believes there are souls all about us, who, unless we get at them and save them, will be lost.

When the Saviour said "Go out," "Compel them to come in," it is not difficult to imagine some unbelievers in Mission methods saying, "Oh, if they won't come in, let them stay out."

Had they spoken their minds, it is even less difficult to imagine the Saviour of men rebuking them in words something like these :

"There will be some among them who will go into the Kingdom before you, and some among you who will be cast out."

GEORGE R. VAN DE WATER.

## Contemporary Ecclesiastical and University History.

### The Lambeth Conference.

THE Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops is a thing of the past. It has formed a significant feature of the times. In both number and influence it has surpassed its predecessors. At the first Conference, held in 1868, under the presidency of Archbishop Longley, seventy-five bishops were present. In the second Conference in 1878, during the presidency of Archbishop Tait there were in attendance one hundred and one bishops. At the Conference of 1888, presided over by Archbishop Benson, one hundred and forty-five bishops were present. This certainly indicates that the number of bishops has been increased, and that there has been a corresponding increase in the movement itself. These bishops of the Church have gathered from all parts of the world. Many of them have travelled thousands of miles at great inconvenience and expense; and all have been influenced by an ardent desire to represent faithfully the Church in their respective Dioceses, and to advance the interest of the Church generally throughout the world.

The Conference has made no pretence to legislative authority; there has been no assumption of an *ex cathedra* power. From their exalted official position, from their high personal character and attainments, and from the circumstances with which they have assembled and deliberated, the utmost deference is due to the published decisions or opinions of the bishops. But those decisions are not announced as binding upon the Church, or as co-equal in authority with the decrees of a general Council of the Church. They are recommendations not Canons; and they are commended to the faith-

ful by their own intrinsic importance not less than by the official sanction of the Conference itself.

The preparations for the Conference had been carefully made, and the opening ceremony and services were most imposing and impressive. On Saturday, June 30, the first service was held in Canterbury Cathedral, when an official welcome was extended to the assembled bishops by the Archbishop of Canterbury. About one hundred bishops were in attendance, of whom twenty-one were from the American Church. In addition an immense throng of the clergy and laity of the Church crowded the cathedral. After an appropriate service the following Allocution was delivered by the Archbishop, sitting in the time-honored chair of S. Augustine :—

Brethren most dear, and to me most reverend, few privileges of any office can surpass that which, though unworthy, I exercise to-day. It is to bid you welcome in the name of the LORD. Happy should my soul be if it were given me to take in all that such welcome means. Welcome, from all continents and seas and shores where the English tongue is spoken. Welcome, bearers of the great commission to be His witnesses unto the end of the earth. Welcome, disciples of the great determination to refuse favors and seek the inspiration of the Church at the fountain head of inspired reason. Welcome to the chair, which, when filled least worthily, most takes up its own parable and speaks of unbroken lines of government, and law, and faith, and forgets not the yet earlier Christianity of the land, whose own lines soon flowed into and blended with the Roman, and the Gaelic, and the Saxon strains. Round this chair have clustered the glorious memorials you see through ages, none more dear than his who spoke from it last with a pathos and a courage quite his own. His simple words, to you, our brethren of the great Republic, the particular welcome from himself which his great sorrow and your love privileged him to give you, still shed a tender human light upon the solemn matters we are to treat of, and the heavenly enterprises to which we and our successors are pledged. We know how dear to you is this sanctuary of our fathers and yours; yes, of 'your Father and our Father.' And even because of the potency of its deep appeal to us to be holy in worship, pure in doctrine, strong in life—even for this appeal's sake we bid you here remember the pregnant words of Gregory to Augustine himself, '*Non pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt*' (Love not the things for the sake of the genus of the place, love the place for the

good things wrought there). This he said in answer to Augustine's question—'The faith being one, are there different customs in different churches?' The answer was worthy of him who has been called the greatest of the Popes, and called the first of the Methodists. He says, you remember, 'What thou hast found in any church more pleasing to the Almighty God, that do thou solicitously choose out, and in the English Church, young in the faith, pour in with excellent instruction what thou gatherest from many churches.' For the moment, while his church was young, Augustine stood in a strange, unique position, commissioned to represent in one person the very Church itself which sent him, and bound to represent the future Church for which he was responsible. Were the words not prophetic and characteristic? The task assigned him as surely fulfilled itself in the manifoldness of his Church, the embracingness, the comprehensiveness, and the integrity of her spirit—the versatility with which she enters into the life of new nations, the readiness with which she receives them to herself, the simplicity of the unvarying rule of her faith, yet the steadfastness of the claim she makes for other churches as well as for herself, that they have liberty in things doubtful or indifferent. We honor her when we say she has all the right which the most venerable churches have to order her service of God as they did, 'according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners,' so that nothing be ordained against God's word. We vindicate her dignity when we say the right is hers not ours. It is for her to choose for us, and not we for ourselves; for her in her lasting power, not for us separately in our passing weakness. We honor her when we say that her right is the right of all churches and of no individuals. If this voice of Gregory to Augustine be worked into the fabric of our Church, it may be the 'sermon in stones' which we shall hear to-day as the last echoes of the service tremble along the arches, and seem to fancy's ear to quiver with anxiety to leave one true tone with us for comfort and for strength. It is this liberty, for all the Holy Churches of God, loyal allegiance of Churchmen to each his own. Lastly, may he inspire and bless the work of all believers, be they Churchmen or no, who love the LORD JESUS CHRIST in sincerity and truth.

On Monday evening, July 2, a special service was held in Westminster Abbey. The spacious edifice was crowded, and more than one hundred bishops, many of them attended by their chaplains, walked in procession through the Abbey to their respective seats. It was an imposing scene. The sermon

was preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury on the character, growth, and work of the Church, and was an eloquent and able presentation of the truth. The third of the opening services was held in Lambeth palace Chapel on Tuesday morning, July 3. It consisted of a celebration of the Holy Communion, and of a sermon by Bishop Whipple, of Minnesota, who had been appointed to this duty by Bishop Williams, as Presiding Bishop of the American Church. The sermon of the Bishop was a luminous and earnest exposition of the principle and duty of Christian Unity, of Christian Missions, and of Christian Work generally. It was very effective, and was much appreciated and admired.

The business deliberations of the conference began in the afternoon of the same day. It was introduced by an opening address from the Archbishop of Canterbury, after which the second subject on the programme was discussed, viz.: "Definite teaching of the Faith to various classes, and means thereto." The speakers appointed to introduce the subject were the Bishops of London, Maine, and Carlisle. During the week, up to Friday, July 6, sessions were held daily, when the following topics were considered :

"The Anglican Communion in Relation to the Eastern Churches, to the Scandinavian and other Reformed Churches, to the Old Catholics, and others." Introduced by the Archbishop of Dublin, and the Bishops of Winchester, Gibraltar, Litchfield, Jamaica, and Bishop Blyth.

"Polygamy of Heathen Converts.—Divorce." Introduced by the Bishops of Durham, Chester, Zululand, the Niger, Maryland, and Bombay.

"Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship." Introduced by the Bishops of Sydney, Aberdeen, Western New York, Salisbury, and Albany.

"Mutual Relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion." Introduced by the Bishops of Capetown, Brechin, and Derry.

"The Church's Practical Work in Relation to (a) Intemperance; (b) Purity; (c) Care of Emigrants; (d) Socialism." Introduced (a) by the Bishops of London and New York; (b) by the Bishops of Durham and Calcutta; (c) by the Bishops of

Liverpool, North Queensland, and Quebec; (d) by the Bishops of Manchester and Mississippi.

At the close of each discussion a Committee was appointed to consider and report on the subject. These several Committees held meetings for conference and discussion from July 9 to July 21. On Monday, July 23, the Conference formally re-assembled, and continued its daily sessions up to Friday, July 27. The reports and resolutions of the different Committees were received and acted on, the judgment of the Conference being embodied in a series of resolutions which accompany the Encyclical Letter addressed by the Bishops to the Church. The concluding service of the Conference was held in S. Paul's Cathedral on Saturday, July 28. An immense congregation was present. The Holy Communion was celebrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by Bishops Whipple, Temple, and others. A magnificent sermon was preached by the Archbishop of York on the power of Christianity, and the work and prospects of the Church. The services throughout the Conference were most impressive, the discussions most earnest, and the conclusions arrived at most deliberate and emphatic.

Both the reports of the Committees and the resolutions of the Conference have been published, together with the Encyclical Letter. Our limited space precludes the publication of these documents in full; and since the Letter embodies the substance of the reports and the resolutions, we prefer to give insertion to that entire. It should be read and preserved. The following is the Encyclical:

*To the Faithful in Jesus Christ, Greeting:* We, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and forty-five in number, all having superintendence over Dioceses, or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our LORD 1888, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Edward, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England and Metropolitan, after receiving in the chapel of the said Palace the Blessed Sacrament of the LORD's Body and Blood, and uniting in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into

consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world. We have made these matters the subject of careful and serious deliberation during the month past, both in general Conference and in committees specially appointed to consider the several questions, and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions at which we have arrived. We have appended to this letter two sets of documents, the one containing the formal resolutions of the Conference, and the other the reports of the several committees. We desire you to bear in mind that the Conference is responsible for the first alone. The reports of committees can only be taken to represent the mind of the Conference in so far as they are reaffirmed or directly adopted in the resolutions; but we have thought good to print these reports, believing that they will offer fruitful matter for consideration. In the first place, we desire to speak of the moral and practical questions which have engaged the attention of the Conference; and in the forefront we would place the duty of the Church in the promotion of temperance and purity.

*Temperance.*—Noble and self-denying efforts have been made for many years, within and without the Church, for the suppression of intemperance, and it is our earnest hope that these efforts will be increased manifold. The evil effects of this sin on the life of the Church and the nation can scarcely be exaggerated. But we are constrained to utter a caution against a false principle which threatens to creep in and vitiate much useful work. Highly valuable as we believe total abstinence to be as a means to an end, we desire to discountenance the language which condemns the use of wine as wrong in itself, independently of its effects on ourselves or on others; and we have expressed our disapproval of a reported practice (which seems to be due to some extent to the tacit assumption of this principle) of substituting some other liquid in the celebration of Holy Communion.

*Purity.*—On the other hand, Christian society is only now awakening to a sense of its active duty in the matter of purity; and we therefore desire to avail ourselves of an occasion which has brought together representatives of the Anglican Communion from distant parts of the world to proclaim a crusade against that sin, which is before all others a defilement of the body of CHRIST, and a desecration of the temple of the Holy Spirit. We recall the earnest language of the Report; we believe that nothing short of a general action by all Christian people will avail to arrest the evil; we call upon you to rally round

the standard of a high and pure morality ; and we appeal to all whom our voice may reach to assist us in raising the tone of public opinion, and in stamping out ignoble and corrupt traditions which are not only a dishonor to the name of our Master, CHRIST, but degrading to the dignity of a being created in the image of God.

*Sanctity of Marriage.*—In vital connection with the promotion of purity is the maintenance of the sanctity of marriage, which is the centre of social morality. This is seriously compromised by facilities of divorce which have been increased in recent years by legislation in some countries. We have therefore held it our duty to reaffirm emphatically the precept of CHRIST relating thereto, and to offer some advice which may guide the clergy of our Communion in their attitude toward any infringement of the Master's rule.

*Polygamy.*—The sanctity of marriage as a Christian obligation implies the faithful union of one man with one woman until the union is severed by death. The polygamous alliances of heathen races are allowed on all hands to be condemned by the law of CHRIST ; but they present many difficult practical problems, which have been solved in various ways in the past. We have carefully considered this question in the different lights thrown upon it from various parts of the mission field. While we have refrained from offering advice on minor points, leaving these to be settled by the local authorities of the Church, we have laid down some broad lines on which alone we consider that the missionary may safely act. Our first care has been to maintain and protect the Christian conception of marriage, believing that any immediate and rapid successes which might otherwise have been secured in the mission field would be dearly purchased by any lowering or confusion of this idea.

*Observance of the Lord's Day.*—The due observance of Sunday as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching has a direct bearing on the moral well-being of the Christian community. We have observed of late a growing laxity which threatens to impair its sacred character. We strongly deprecate this tendency. We call upon the leisurely classes not selfishly to withdraw from others the opportunities of rest and of religion. We call upon master and employer jealously to guard the privileges of the servant and the workman. In "the LORD's Day" we have a priceless heritage. Whoever misuses it incurs a terrible responsibility.

*Socialism.*—Intimately connected with these moral questions is the attitude of the Christian Church toward the social problems of the day. Excessive inequality in the distribution of this world's goods,

vast accumulation and desperate poverty side by side—these suggest many anxious considerations to any thoughtful person who is penetrated with the mind of CHRIST. No more important problems can well occupy the attention—whether of Clergy or Laity—than such as are connected with what is popularly called Socialism. To study schemes proposed for redressing the social balance, to welcome the good which may be found in the aims or operations of any, and to devise methods, whether by legislation or by social combinations, or in any other way, for a peaceful solution of the problems, without violence or injustice, is one of the noblest pursuits which can engage the thoughts of those who strive to follow in the footsteps of CHRIST. Suggestions are offered in the report which may assist in solving this problem.

*Care of Emigrants.*—One class of persons more especially had a claim upon the consideration and sympathy of the Conference. In our emigrants we have a social link which binds the Churches of the British Islands to the Church of the United States and to the Churches in the colonies. No more pertinent question, therefore, could have been suggested for our deliberations than our duty towards this large body of our fellow Christians. It is especially incumbent upon the Church to follow them with the eye of sympathy at every point in their passage from their old home to their new, to exercise a watchful care over them, and to protect them from the dangers, moral and spiritual, which beset their path. We have endeavored to offer some suggestions, by following which this end may be attained.

*Definite Teaching of the Faith.*—Recognising thus the primary importance of maintaining the moral precepts and discipline of the Gospel in all the relations of life and society, we proceed to the consideration of the means, within the reach and contemplation of the Churches, for inculcating the definite truths of the Faith, which are the basis of such moral teaching. We cannot escape the conviction that this department of work requires great attention and much improvement. The religious teaching of the young is sadly deficient in depth and reality, especially in the matter of doctrine. This deficiency is not confined to any class of society, and the task of remedying the default is one which the Laity must be prepared to share with the Clergy. On parents it lies as a Divine charge. Godfathers and Godmothers should be urged to fulfil the duty which they have undertaken for the children whose sponsors they have been, and to see that they are not left uninstructed, or inadequately prepared for Confirmation. The use

of public catechising and regular preparation of candidates for Confirmation is capable of much development. The work done in Sunday Schools requires, as we believe, more constant supervision and more sustained interest than, in a great many cases, it receives from the Clergy. The instruction of Sunday School teachers, and of pupil teachers in Elementary Schools, ought to be regarded as an indispensable part of the pastoral work of the Parish Priest; and the moral and practical lessons from the Bible ought to be enforced by constant reference to the sanctions, and the illustrations of doctrine and discipline belonging to them, to be found in the same Holy Scripture. It would be possible, to a greater extent than is now done, to make sermons in Church combine doctrinal and moral efficiency, and, by illustrating the *rationale* of Divine service, lead on the congregations to the perception of the definite relations between worship, faith and work—the lessons of the Prayer Book, the Catechism and the Creeds. It is not, however, with reference to the young alone, or to the recognised members of their own flock, that the clergy have need to look carefully to the security of definiteness in teaching the Faith. The study of Holy Scripture is a great part of the mental discipline of the Christian, and the Bible itself is the main instrument in all teaching of religion. Unhappily, in the present day, there is a widespread system of propagandism hostile to the reception of the Bible as a treasury of Divine knowledge, and throughout society in all its ranks, misgivings, doubts, hostile criticisms, and sceptical estimates of doctrinal truths as based on Revelation, are very common. The doubts which arise from the misapprehension of due relations between science and religion may be, and ought to be, treated with respect and a sympathetic patience; and where minds have been disquieted by scientific discovery or assertion, great care should be taken not to extinguish the elements of faith, but rather to direct the thinker to the realisation of the fact that such discoveries elucidate the action of laws which, rightly conceived, tend to the higher appreciation of the glorious work of the Creator, upheld by the word of His power. The dangers arising from the hostile or sceptical temper and attitude are increased by the difficulty of determining how far our teaching and the popular acceptance of it can be harmonised with a due consideration for the views on inspiration, and especially, on the character of the discipline of the Old Testament dispensation, which, although they have never received definite sanction in the Church, have been long and widely prevalent. We must recommend to the clergy cautious and industrious treatment of these points of controversy, and most earnestly press upon them the importance of taking, as the central thought of their teaching, our

LORD JESUS CHRIST, as the sacrifice of our sins, as the healer of our sinfulness, the source of all our spiritual life, and the revelation to our consciences of the law and motive of all moral virtue. To Him and to His work all the teachings of the Old Testament converge, and from Him all the teachings of the New Testament flow, in spirit, in force, and in form. The work of the Church is the application and extension of the blessings of the Incarnation, and her teaching and development of its doctrinal issues as contained in the creeds of the Church.

*Mutual Relations.*—Our discussion on the mutual relations of Dioceses and branches of our Communion has brought out some points which we desire to commend to your consideration. It appears necessary to draw attention to the principles laid down in the conference of 1878, and to urge that within our Communion the duly certified action of each Church or Province should be respected by the other Churches and their members; that no bishop or clergyman should exercise his functions within any regularly constituted Diocese without the consent of the bishop of that Diocese, and that no bishop should authorise the action of any clergyman coming from another Diocese without proper letters testimonial. The neglect of these rules has led to some grievous scandals. The bishops, on their part, are prepared to do their best to guard against such mischiefs by adding private advice to the formal document in use, but the clergy must resolve to exercise greater caution in signing testimonials; and those who require them must check all tendency to over-sensitiveness, when they find themselves subjected to inquiries as to character and identification, which, however unnecessary they may deem them in their own case, are certainly indispensable for securing such measure of safety as we require. This caution applies with especial force to the clergy ordained for Colonial work. We most heartily recognise the principle that those who have given the best years of their life to work abroad are entitled to great consideration when the time comes at which they want such rest or change of employment as may be found at home. But to lay down any general rules on this point is impossible. One matter has been laid before us in a more formal way—the possibility of constituting a council or councils of reference to advise upon, or even to decide, questions laid before them by the authorities of the provinces of the Colonial Church. As to this, we would counsel patient consideration and consultation, of such character as may eventually supersede the necessity for creating an authority which might, whether as a council of advice, or in a function more closely resembling that of a court, place

us in circumstances prejudicial alike to order and to liberty of action.

*Home Reunion.*—After anxious discussion we have resolved to content ourselves with laying down certain articles as a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made toward home reunion. These articles, four in number, will be found in the appended resolutions. The attitude of the Anglican Communion toward the religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this: We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realised, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit intrusted to us. We cannot desert our position either as to Faith or Discipline. That concord would in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender. But we gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our Communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labors for CHRIST's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world, there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore toward Christian fellowship. The conference has shown in its discussions, as well as its resolutions, that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences.

*Relation to the Scandinavian Church.*—Among the nations with whom English-speaking peoples are brought directly in contact are the Scandinavian races, who form an important element of the population in many of our Dioceses. The attitude, therefore, which the Anglican Communion should take toward the Scandinavian Churches could not be a matter of indifference to this conference. We have recommended that fuller knowledge should be sought and friendly intercourse interchanged until such time as matters may be riper for a closer alliance without any sacrifice of principles which we hold to be essential.

*To Old Catholics and Others.*—Nor, again, is it possible for the

members of the Anglican Communion to withhold their sympathies from those Continental movements toward reformation which, under the greatest difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same lines as our own, retaining Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance. Though we believe that the time has not come for any direct alliance with any of these, and though we deprecate any precipitancy of action which would transgress primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, we believe that advances may be made without sacrifice of these, and we entertain the hope that the time may come when a more formal alliance with some at least of these bodies will be possible.

*To the Eastern Churches.*—The conference has expressed its earnest desire to confirm and improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion. These churches have well earned the sympathy of Christendom, for through long ages of persecution they have kept alive in many a dark place the light of the Gospel. If that light is here and there feeble and dim, there is all the more reason that we, as we have opportunity, should tend and cherish it; and we need not fear that our offices of brotherly charity, if offered in a right spirit, will not be accepted. We reflect with thankfulness that there exist no bars, such as are presented to Communion with the Latins by the formulated sanction of the infallibility of the Church residing in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and other dogmas imposed by the decrees of Papal Councils. The Church of Rome has always treated her Eastern sister wrongfully. She intrudes her bishops into the ancient Dioceses, and keeps up a system of active proselytism. The Eastern Church is reasonably outraged by these proceedings, wholly contrary as they are to Catholic principles; and it behooves us of the Anglican Communion to take care that we do not offend in like manner. Individuals craving fuller light and stronger spiritual life may, by remaining in the Church of their Baptism, become centres of enlightenment to their own people. But though all schemes of proselytising are to be avoided, it is only right that our real claim and position as a historical Church should be set before a people who are very distrustful of novelty, especially in religion, and who appreciate the history of Catholic antiquity. Help should be given towards the education of the clergy, and, in more destitute communities, extended to schools for general instruction.

*Authoritative Standards.*—The authoritative standards of doctrine and worship claim your careful attention in connection with these subjects. It is of the utmost importance that our Faith and practice

should be represented, both to the ancient churches and to the native and growing churches in the mission field, in a manner which will neither give cause for offence nor restrict due liberty, nor present any stumbling blocks in the way of complete communion. In conformity with the practice of the former Conferences we declare that we are united under our Divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Œcumenical Councils: as standards of doctrine and worship alike we recognise the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles,—the special heritage of the Church of England, and, to a greater or less extent, received by all the Churches of our Communion.

We desire that these standards should be set before the foreign Churches in their purity and simplicity. A certain liberty of treatment must be extended to the cases of native and growing Churches, on which it would be unreasonable to impose, as conditions of communion, the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, colored as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they were originally drawn up. On the other hand it would be impossible for us to share with them in the matter of Holy Orders, as in complete intercommunion, without satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same form of doctrine as ourselves. It ought not to be difficult, much less impossible, to formulate articles, in accordance with our own standards of doctrine and worship, the acceptance of which should be required of all ordained in such Churches.

We close this letter rendering our humble and hearty thanks to Almighty GOD for His great goodness towards us. We have been permitted to meet together in larger numbers than heretofore. Contributions of knowledge and experience have been poured into the common stock from all parts of the earth. We have realised, more fully than it was possible to realise before, the extent, the power, and the influence of the great Anglican Communion. We have felt its capacities, its opportunities, its privileges. In our common deliberations we have tested its essential oneness amidst all varieties of condition and development. Wherever there was diversity of opinion among us there was also harmony of spirit and unity of aim; and we shall return to our several Dioceses refreshed, strengthened and inspired by the memories which we shall carry away.

But the sense of thanksgiving is closely linked with the obligation of duty. This fuller realisation of our privileges as members of the Anglican Communion carries with it a heightened sense of our respon-

sibilities which do not end with our own people or with the mission field alone, but extend to all Churches of God. The opportunities of an exceptional position call us to an exceptional work. It is our earnest prayer that all—Clergy and laity alike—may take God's manifest purpose to heart, and strive in their several stations to work it out in all its fulness.

With these parting words we commend the results at which we have arrived in this Conference to your careful consideration, praying that the Holy Spirit may direct your thoughts and lead you to all truth, and that our counsels may redound through your action to the glory of God and the increase of CHRIST's kingdom.

Signed, on behalf of the Conference,

EDW: CANTUAR:

C. J. GLOUCESTER & BRISTOL,  
*Episcopal Secretary.*

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,  
Dean of Windsor,  
*General Secretary.*

B. F. SMITH,  
Archdeacon of Maidstone,  
*Assistant Secretary.*

The Conference has thus obtained some practical results. It has borne an emphatic testimony to the Faith, has entered a solemn protest against immorality and social disorder, has avowed an earnest desire for the re-union of Christendom, and has given its approval and encouragement to every good work in which the Church can engage. Such a Conference is proof of the spiritual life and zeal of the Church which gave it birth; and such a Conference in its direct and indirect influences will aid immensely in the universal establishment of that Kingdom which consisteth not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace and joy in the HOLY GHOST.

---

LIST OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1888, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES.

---

Archbishop of Canterbury (Most Rev. Dr. Benson).

Bishop of London (Rt. Rev. Dr. Temple).

" Winchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Harold Browne).

" Norwich (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Pelham).

" Bangor (Rt. Rev. Dr. Campbell).

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ellicott).

- " S. Alban's (Rt. Rev. Dr. Claughton).
- " Hereford (Rt. Rev. Dr. Atlay).
- " Peterborough (Rt. Rev. Dr. Magee).
- " Bath and Wells (Rt. Rev. Lord A. Hervey).
- " Chichester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Durnford).
- " S. Asaph (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hughes).
- " S. Davids (Rt. Rev. Dr. Basil Jones).
- " Rochester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thorold).
- " Litchfield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Maclagan).
- " Llandaff (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lewis).
- " Truro (Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilkinson).
- " Southwell (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ridding).
- " Lincoln (Rt. Rev. Dr. King).
- " Exeter (Rt. Rev. Dr. E. H. Bickersteth).
- " Salisbury (Rt. Rev. Dr. J. Wordsworth).
- " Ely (Rt. Rev. Lord A. Compton).

Bishop Suffragan of Dover (Rt. Rev. Dr. Parry).

- " Nottingham (Rt. Rev. Dr. Trollope).
- " Colchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Blomfield).
- " Marlborough (Rt. Rev. Dr. Earle).
- " Shrewsbury (Rt. Rev. Sir L. Stamer).
- " Bedford (Rt. Rev. Dr. Billing).
- " Leicester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thicknesse).

Bishop Perry.

- " Tufnell.
- " Bromby.
- " Wilkinson.
- " Mitchinson.

---

Archbishop of York (Most Rev. Dr. Thomson).

Bishop of Durham (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lightfoot):

- " Carlisle (Rt. Rev. Dr. Goodwin).
- " Manchester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Moorhouse).
- " Wakefield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsham How).
- " Liverpool (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ryle).
- " Newcastle (Rt. Rev. Dr. Wilberforce).
- " Chester (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stubbs).
- " Ripon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Boyd Carpenter).
- " Sodor and Man (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bardsley).

Bishop Suffragan of Penrith (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pulleine).

- " Cramer-Roberts.

---

Archbishop of Armagh (Most Rev. Dr. Knox).

Bishop of Meath (Most Rev. Dr. Reichel).

- " Derry (Rt. Rev. Dr. Alexander).
- " Kilmore (Rt. Rev. Dr. Shone).
- " Clogher (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stack).

---

Archbishop of Dublin (Most Rev. Lord Plunket).

Bishop of Limerick (Rt. Rev. Dr. Graves).

- " Cashel (Rt. Rev. Dr. Day).
- " Cork (Rt. Rev. Dr. Gregg).

Bishop of Ossory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walsh).

“ Killaloe (Rt. Rev. Dr. Chester).

---

Bishop of Brechin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Jermyn), *Primus*.

“ S. Andrew's (Rt. Rev. Dr. C. Wordsworth).

“ Moray and Ross (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kelly).

“ Aberdeen (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Douglas).

“ Argyll and the Isles (Rt. Rev. Dr. Haldane).

“ Edinburgh (Rt. Rev. Dr. Dowden).

---

Bishop of Minnesota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whipple).

“ Western New York (Rt. Rev. Dr. Coxe).

“ Tennessee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Quintard).

“ Maine (Rt. Rev. Dr. Neely).

“ Missouri (Rt. Rev. Dr. Tuttle).

“ Oregon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Morris).

“ Albany (Rt. Rev. Dr. Doane).

“ Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whitaker).

“ Arkansas (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pierce).

“ South Dakota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hare).

“ Massachusetts (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paddock).

“ North Carolina (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lyman).

“ Colorado (Rt. Rev. Dr. Spalding).

“ Milwaukee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Welles).

“ New Jersey (Rt. Rev. Dr. Scarborough).

“ Chicago (Rt. Rev. Dr. McLaren).

“ Iowa (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stevens Perry).

“ Quincy (Rt. Rev. Dr. Burgess).

“ Springfield (Rt. Rev. Dr. Seymour).

“ Michigan (Rt. Rev. Dr. Harris).

“ Newark (Rt. Rev. Dr. Starkey).

“ Washington Territory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paddock).

“ Pittsburgh (Rt. Rev. Dr. Whitehead).

“ Mississippi (Rt. Rev. Dr. Thompson).

“ Indiana (Rt. Rev. Dr. Knickerbacker).

“ New York (Rt. Rev. Dr. Potter).

“ North Dakota (Rt. Rev. Dr. Walker).

Asst. Bishop of Central Pennsylvania (Rt. Rev. Dr. Rulison).

Bishop of Maryland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Paret).

---

Bishop of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. Dr. Medley), *Metropolitan*.

“ Ontario (Rt. Rev. Dr. Lewis).

“ Quebec (Rt. Rev. Dr. Williams).

“ Toronto (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sweatman).

“ Algoma (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sullivan).

“ Huron (Rt. Rev. Dr. Baldwin).

“ Niagara (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hamilton).

“ Nova Scotia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Courtney).

Bishop Coadjutor of Fredericton (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kingdon).

---

Bishop of Calcutta (Rt. Rev. Dr. Johnson), *Metropolitan*.

“ Colombo (Rt. Rev. Dr. Copleston).

“ Bombay (Rt. Rev. Dr. Mylne).

Bishop of Travancore & Cochin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Speechley).  
" Rangoon (Rt. Rev. Dr. Strachan).

---

Bishop of Guiana (Rt. Rev. Dr. Austin), *Metropolitan*.  
" Antigua (Rt. Rev. Dr. Jackson).  
" Trinidad (Rt. Rev. Dr. Rawle).  
" Jamaica (Rt. Rev. Dr. Nuttall).  
" Barbadoes (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bree).  
" Nassau (Rt. Rev. Dr. Churton).  
Bishop Coadjutor of Antigua (Rt. Rev. Dr. Branch).

---

Bishop of Sydney (Rt. Rev. Dr. Barry), *Metropolitan*.  
" North Queensland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stanton).  
" Adelaide (Rt. Rev. Dr. Kennion).  
" Brisbane (Rt. Rev. Dr. Webber).  
Bishop of Nelson (Rt. Rev. Dr. Suter).  
" Auckland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Cowie).  
" Dunedin (Rt. Rev. Dr. Neville).  
" Waiapu (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stuart).

---

Bishop of Capetown (Rt. Rev. Dr. W. W. Jones), *Metropolitan*.  
" Maritzburg (Rt. Rev. Dr. Macrorie).  
" Grahamstown (Rt. Rev. Dr. Webb).  
" Pretoria (Rt. Rev. Dr. Bousfield).  
" Zululand (Rt. Rev. Dr. Mackenzie).  
" St. John's, Kaffraria (Rt. Rev. Dr. Key).

---

Bishop of Rupertsland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Machray), *Metropolitan*.  
" Moosonee (Rt. Rev. Dr. Horden).  
" Qu'Appelle (Rt. Rev. and Hon. Dr. Anson).  
" Saskatchewan & Calgary (Rt. Rev. Dr. Pinkham).

---

Bishop of Columbia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hills).  
Missionary Bishop in the Niger Territory (Rt. Rev. Dr. Crowther).  
Bishop of the Falkland Islands (Rt. Rev. Dr. Stirling).  
" Honolulu (Rt. Rev. Dr. Willis).  
" Gibraltar (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sandford).  
" Newfoundland (Rt. Rev. Dr. Llewellyn Jones).  
" Caledonia (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ridley).  
" New Westminster (Rt. Rev. Dr. Sillitoe).  
Missionary Bishop in North China (Rt. Rev. Dr. Scott).  
Bishop of Singapore and Sarawak (Rt. Rev. Dr. Hose).  
" Sierra Leone (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ingham).  
Missionary Bishop in Central Africa (Rt. Rev. Dr. Smythies).  
" " Japan (Rt. Rev. Dr. E. Bickersteth).  
Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem and the East (Rt. Rev. Dr. Blyth).

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE:

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Rt. Rev. Dr. Ellicott), *Episcopal Secretary*.  
Dean of Windsor (Very Rev. R. T. Davidson), *General Secretary*.  
Archdeacon of Maidstone (Rev. B. F. Smith), *Assistant Secretary*.

## Necrological Record.

Samuel Smith Harris, D.D., LL.D.,  
Bishop of Michigan.

A HEAVY blow has fallen upon the Church in the death of the Right Reverend Samuel Smith Harris, D.D., LL.D., late Bishop of Michigan. In an enfeebled state of health he went to England during the summer to attend the Lambeth Conference, intending also to visit the Holy Land and other places of interest in Europe. On Sunday, July 29, the day after the Conference closed, the Bishop was seized with paralysis whilst preaching in Winchester Cathedral. He never rallied, and after suffering for three weeks, he closed his eyes in death on Tuesday, August 21.

The career of Bishop Harris was singularly varied and instructive. At the beginning of his life he was a soldier; after the war he became a lawyer; and finally he was ordained a priest of the LORD. His advancement in the Church was unusually rapid. It was not until the year 1869, or when he was twenty-eight years of age, that he was admitted to the sacred ministry, being ordained both deacon and priest in the same year. The first years of his ministry were spent in the South, in Montgomery, Alabama; Columbus, Georgia; and New Orleans, Louisiana. In 1875 he became Rector of S. James Church, Chicago, where he remained until his election to the Episcopate. An election to the newly formed Diocese of Quincy, Ill., was declined by him, after which he was elected Bishop of Michigan. Both before and after his election, the Universities and the Church manifested their appreciation of his character and services by conferring honors upon him, and by placing him in offices of trust. He was twice elected a deputy to the General Convention, and was honored with the degrees of D.D. and LL.D.

The election to the bishopric of Michigan was accepted by him in a spirit of faith and courage. He proved himself equal to the onerous duties of his office, and his Diocese and the Church were benefited by his labors. During nine years he devoted himself zealously to his work, sparing no toil and shrinking from no sacrifice whereby he could make full proof of his ministry and advance the interests of the Church. As a preacher he was eloquent; as an administrator he was efficient; as a writer he was original and instructive. "His favorite theme," it has been said, "was the prophetic character of the Christian ministry, which is sent to interpret and apply the Gospel of CHRIST to the minds and special perplexities of successive generations; and next to the fulfillment of that function, he was most concerned rightly to interpret the position of the Church to Christians of other religious bodies." His intellectual resources were large; his religious life was active; his Church sentiment was strong; his personal presence was commanding; and with a singular power of adaptation and energy of will, he was able to meet the ever-increasing demands of his Diocese and the Church. In the performance of his office he was, therefore, remarkably successful; and his widowed Diocese has indeed cause to bewail her loss. When so unexpectedly cut down he was apparently in the prime of his manhood and the fulness of his strength, and with good reason the Church could hope for many years of vigorous, useful work. The undue strain there had been upon him, had, however, already told fatally upon both mind and body; and ere remedial influences could be applied the end came.

On Wednesday, August 22, a memorial service was held in Westminster Abbey. It was a touching tribute to the Bishop's worth. Many of the American bishops and visitors were present; and a tender and affecting address was delivered by Bishop Thompson, of Mississippi. When the body arrived in New York, it was borne to Grace Church, where another appropriate service was held, and where, amidst the lamentations of a large circle of friends, Bishop Potter bore eloquent testimony to the noble qualities of the deceased Bishop, and to the painful emotions his premature death had caused. The remains were conveyed to Detroit, where a final service was

conducted in S. Paul's Church on September 4. Bishops Gillespie, Worthington and Peterkin officiated; a large number of the clergy and citizens were present; and the ceremony was very solemn and impressive. In the death of Bishop Harris a prince in Israel has fallen; and not only his immediate friends, but the Church at large may cherish a grateful remembrance of his lovely character and of his useful life.

## Contemporary Literature.

[A number of reviews already in type are unavoidably crowded out. In the future considerable space will be devoted to this department.—ED.]

### The Story of Our Lord.

THE Gospel story of our Divine Saviour grows old, indeed, with the centuries, but it never loses its sacred and absorbing interest. Every succeeding age of the world bears witness to its mystical power upon the human heart. The experience of the Christian Ages teaches that one secret source of faith and devotion is to be found in the contemplative study of the sinless Life of the Redeemer. The more often the regenerate mind beholds the blessed portraiture, enshrined in the Gospels, the more instinctive, as it were, is its reverence and homage. The S. John's and Mary Magdalene's in every age of the Church are those happy souls that love most because they gaze most. It is, therefore, a matter of vital importance in this age of loose religious training and shallow spiritual culture that the young particularly should learn to love the story of the Son of Blessed S. Mary; that it should appeal with fascinating power to their imaginations and thereby gain benignant influence over their hearts and lives; that the child mind when naturally unsceptical should receive a vital impression of the historical CHRIST.

We feel grateful, then, to the author of the book, entitled *The Story of Our Lord*,\* for the measure of success achieved in the delicate work of embodying in story form the Gospel narrative. The substance of the work properly adheres with closeness to the inspired text and is thoroughly reverent in tone and feeling. The simplicity of literary expression is well sustained throughout, and harmonises with the specific design of the work. A rich and very attractive feature is in the pictures. They are engravings on wood, illustrating subjects of Christian Art, and are of rare execution. If we were inclined to fault at all the author's method of treatment, it would be in the matter of the absence of *definite* Christian instruction. Practical experience in the training of the young proves that the child mind can grasp with comparative ease the formulas of our Holy Faith. A vein of dogmatic teaching running through this

\**The Story of Our Lord*. By FRANCES YOUNGHUSBAND, London: Longmans Green, and Co. 1887

story would have rendered the work, good as it is, even more effective and valuable a contribution to our juvenile religious literature.

FRANKLIN as a Man of Letters\* is like Napoleon as a military engineer, or Washington as a land surveyor. But if the massive figure is to be regarded through the small vista of an incidental capacity, perhaps Mr. McMaster has done it as well as anybody could. Still it is hard reading: to forget the great economist, the statesman, the minister, the balance wheel of the American Revolution, and read this twitter of the forgotten tracts, the local and occasional pamphlets, squibs and advertisements, which were the small stepping stones in the first passages to a great career, or even the pastime of a great man's leisure. Still when we regard this series of American MEN of Letters, possibly Benjamin Franklin may be assessed as having as much title to appear there as Margaret Fuller Ossoli.

When Professor, or Mr. McMaster determined to become a historian he chose to get as nearly as he could upon the style of Macauley. And in the present volume, he opens his first chapter with the familiar gait of that celebrated opening sentence in the History of England. However, it is a good style, and good models are better to follow than bad ones. Let us be thankful for what we can get. Professor McMaster's *forte* lies in the way of graphic narrative. When he makes mere compilation of other peoples' collections, his rapid sentences delay rather than accelerate his reader's progress. A biographer should either hate or love his hero. In this American Men of Letters Series, a good example of the former is Holmes' Ralph Waldo Emerson; of the latter, Woodberry's Edgar Poe. Each was a success, because in each the chosen standpoint was consistently occupied. We cannot help thinking that Professor McMaster tries to be too judicial where judgment is already closed. The world for the last century has been reasonably satisfied as to Franklin's niche. Why should Professor McMaster try to revise the title by which he occupies it?

\* *American Men of Letters: Benjamin Franklin.* By JOHN BACH MCMASTER. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1887.

# Church Review Publications.

## COMMUNION WINE.

A Critical Examination of Scripture Words and Historic Testimony. By the  
Rev. EDWARD H. JEWETT, S. T. D. 64 pages. Price, 25 cents.

FROM BISHOP WILLIAMS.

MY DEAR DR. JEWETT:

MIDDLETOWN, CONN., *January 11, 1886.*

I have read your admirable articles on "Communion Wine" with great pleasure and instruction. You have, it seems to me, settled the question beyond possibility of further argument.

The labor of preparing two such articles must have been enormous; and there are not many among us capable of undertaking it.

I am sure you will receive, as you assuredly deserve, the thanks of all persons who desire to learn the meaning and teaching of Holy Scripture fairly brought out *from* it, and not any kind of notion imported *into* it.

Affectionately yours,

JOHN WILLIAMS.

FROM BISHOP SEYMOUR.

MY DEAR BROTHER:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *May 9, 1885.*

From the fact that I have an article in the CHURCH REVIEW for April, I have looked into the number, and in consequence I have seen and read your article on "Communion Wine." I beg to thank you for it. It is *convincing* and *crushing*. The principle involved is of very grave importance. This so-called "temperance movement" is in the line of doing an immense amount of mischief—it is confusing men's minds, and good men's, too, in the distinction between good and evil. Your article is capital.

Affectionately yours,

GEORGE F. SEYMOUR.

The American Church and its Name. By the HON. L. BRADFORD  
PRINCE. 64 pp., paper, 25c.

Judge Prince argues in favor of a change of name in the corporate title of the Church in the United States. The interest taken in the articles by this distinguished representative of the Church has been so great that a reprint of the articles from the *Review* became necessary.

Sent on receipt of price by

The Church Review,

P. O. Box 1839.

NEW YORK.

THE TIFFANY  
GLASS COMPANY  
MEMORIAL WINDOWS  
GLASS WORK DECORATIONS

Designs, with Estimates, Submitted.

LOUIS C. TIFFANY, *Pres.* PRINGLE MITCHELL, *M'gr.*  
JOHN DUFAIS, *Sec.* JOHN CHENEY PLATT, *Treas.*  
333, 335 Fourth Avenue, New York.  
509 Pullman Building, Chicago.

CLINTON H. MENEELY  
BELL COMPANY,  
TROY, N. Y.  
MANUFACTURE SUPERIOR  
CHURCH AND CHIME BELLS.

FRED'K T. CAMP,  
ARCHITECT,

No. 60 Liberty St., New York City.

Plans and Specifications for every kind of building  
executed with faithfulness and promptness. Born and  
bred in the Church, all edifices for parish use are  
thoroughly comprehended. Correspondence solicited.

# Educational Institutions of the Church.

---

## **The General Theological Seminary,**

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK.

The Academical Year begins on Wednesday in the September Ember Week. The entrance examination is held at 9 A. M. Students live in the buildings. Board, coal, gas and care of room, \$225 per annum, payable semi-annually in advance. SPECIAL STUDENTS admitted, and a POST-GRADUATE course for graduates of Theological Seminaries. The requirements for admission, and other particulars, can be had from

Rev. E. A. HOFFMAN, D.D., *Dean*.

---

## **Episcopal Theological School,**

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Twenty-first year begins Sept. 26. The Church's prescribed preparation for Orders pursued in a mature manner, with peculiar local advantages and attractions. Also Special, Post-Graduate, and Post Ordination study provided for, which may be combined with courses in Harvard. Address the Dean,

Rev. GEORGE ZABRISKIE GRAY, D.D.

---

## **Bexley Hall Theological Seminary,**

GAMBIER, OHIO.

Session opens September 15. Route: Pa. R. R. between New York and Chicago, via Cleveland, Akron and Columbus R. R. Rev. Fleming James, D.D., Senior Prof. KENYON COLLEGE. Beautiful for situation, with commodious buildings, affords a thorough liberal education at comparatively small expense. For illustrated pamphlet, with full particulars, address

Rev. Dr. BODINE, *President*.

---

## **Nashotah House,**

NASHOTAH, WISCONSIN.

Receives Candidates for Holy Orders from any Diocese, properly accredited, and maintains its work, as it has done for more than forty years, chiefly by the offerings of the Church received through the daily mail. Correspondence is invited, and remittances will be gratefully received by the president, Rev. GEORGE G. CARTER, Nashotah, Wisconsin. Money-orders should be drawn on Oconomowoc.

### **Divinity School of the Protestant Church,**

PHILADELPHIA.

Complete Faculty, thorough work. Sound learning, manliness, earnest spirituality cultivated in students. Special and Post-Graduate courses. New commodious building, new chapel. Address the Dean,

The Rev. EDWARD T. BARTLETT, D.D.,  
50th St. and Woodland Ave., Philadelphia.

---

### **The Seabury Divinity School,**

FARIBAULT, MINN.

The Academical Year will begin Sept. 29. A full theological course provided, with six resident professors. Special students are received. There is also a preparatory department with a course of study requiring two years. Tuition and rooms free. For calendar and all information apply to

The Rev. F. D. HOSKINS, *Warden*, Faribault, Minn.

---

### **The Western Theological Seminary,**

WASHINGTON BOULEVARD, CHICAGO.

The year begins September 2, Feast of S. Michael and All Angels. For requirements for admission and other particulars, address the Dean,

The Right Rev. WM. E. McLAREN, S.T.D.,  
255 Ontario Street, Chicago.

---

### **S. Stephen's College,**

ANNANDALE-ON-THE-HUDSON.

Is a Training School for the Ministry. The Course of Study for the Degree of B. A. is the same as in colleges generally. The charges for board, washing, fuel, lights, and partly furnished rooms, are \$225 per annum. The next Academic Year will begin the 15th of September.

The Rev. R. B. FAIRBAIRN, D.D., L.L.D., *Warden*.

---

### **S. Hilda's School,**

MORRISTOWN, NEW JERSEY.

A Boarding and Day School for Girls. Under the charge of the Sisters of S. John Baptist. Terms: \$250; Music and Painting extra. For circulars address  
THE SISTER SUPERIOR.

---

### **S. Margaret's Diocesan School for Girls,**

WATERBURY, CONN.

Location upon a hillside, with extensive grounds, pleasant and healthful, combining advantages of city with much of the freedom of the country. Number of Boarding Pupils limited. Apply to

FRANCIS T. RUSSELL, M.A., *Rector*.

---

### **The Hannah More Academy,**

REISTERSTOWN, MARYLAND.

The Diocesan School for Girls. Founded in 1832. Noted for healthfulness, careful training and thorough instruction. 16 miles from Baltimore (West. Maryland R. R.)  
Rev. ARTHUR J. RICH, A.M., M.D., *Rector*.

# THE EVANGELICAL EDUCATION SOCIETY.

Office, 1224 Chestnut St., Phila.

**Aids Theological Students and Distributes  
Evangelical Literature.**

CONTRIBUTIONS EARNESTLY SOLICITED.

PRESIDENT,

HON. FELIX R. BRUNOT.

ACTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,

RT. REV. O. W. WHITAKER, D. D.

GENERAL SECRETARY,

REV. ROBERT C. MATLACK, D. D.

TREASURER,

WILLIAM C. HOUTON, Esq.

## Character of Our Men.

The Society has sent into the Ministry over 400 men. With rare exceptions they are doing efficient work in the ministry. Many of them already occupy posts of large influence and usefulness. Some are Bishops. Six are professors in Theological Seminaries. Several are eminent missionaries. A number are rectors of leading city parishes. Indeed, they are earnestly sought for, and gladly received wherever they go, and, as a rule, they are an honor to the Ministry and to the Church.

## Our Position.

We would by no means lift every burden from the student's back, or remove every obstacle out of his way; but *merely spare him that labor and effort which weaken both mind and body.*

We say deliberately, as the result of most thorough investigation, that *a large proportion of the best Men in the Christian Ministry have been aided by education societies, and that they would have been kept out of the Ministry without that aid, or would have entered it imperfectly prepared for their sacred duties, or with enfeebled health.*

"After careful inquiry and years of experience in the work of education, we affirm that *the withholding of aid almost invariably hastens the ordination of candidates for Holy Orders; so that aid societies may be, and we believe they usually are, the Church's best protection against an uneducated Ministry.*"

I give and bequeath to THE EVANGELICAL EDUCATION SOCIETY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,.....Dollars  
.....Real Estate for the general purposes of the Society.

# SOCIETY

FOR THE

## Increase of the Ministry.

RT. REV. JOHN WILLIAMS, D. D., LL. D.,

President.

REV. ELISHA WHITTLESEY,

Corresponding Secretary.

OFFICE,

37 Spring Street, - Hartford, Conn.

## MERITS.

**SCOPE.**—Strictly educational work. The cost of thorough education puts its advantages beyond the means of many earnest and valuable Candidates. The Society meets the needs of such by limited grants, which make it possible to continue their preparation from year to year till completed.

**PREFERENCE.**—Capability before numbers in the ministry: 1st, by the utmost caution in adopting scholars; 2d, by renewals, if needed, through the College and Seminary course. In short the aim is *old-fashioned education for the ministry*

**AIDS THE MEN DIRECTLY.**—There are two modes of this service,—contributions to the funds of Theological Schools for current expenses; and grants to scholars. The former is only partial in its reach. It leaves out the College training, which is the primary necessity. It does not ease the student in respect of his personal, living, and school expenses. It does not admit of discrimination, in the application of gifts, between strong and weak, worthy and unfit men. On the contrary, the Society's grants are in the form of annual scholarships, to which individuals are appointed on personal acquaintance or approved testimonials.

**APPLICATION OF FUNDS.**—The Society is general in its operations. From the beginning it has had an eye to the wants of the whole Church. Provision in Dioceses for only their own candidates disregards the larger needs of weak Dioceses, and the still more helpless missionary jurisdictions, and is notoriously selfish and suicidal. Large and generous purposes are only reliable in the Body of CHRIST.

**CATHOLICITY**—The Society ignores, in its administration, differences of opinion and Churchmanship; assumes that its scholars are learners, preparing to judge for themselves, and that a "right judgment in all things" is the product of trained faculties and careful study, animated by sincere loyalty to CHRIST and His Church.



**Price Reduced**  
**50 %**  
**This Fixture Heavily Plated**  
—AND—  
**Four 1000-Sheet Rolls**  
**BEST STANDARD BRAND**  
(NOT MEDICATED)  
**DELIVERED FREE**  
Anywhere in the United States  
on receipt of  
**ONE DOLLAR.**

# Albany Perforated Wrapping Paper Co.

MANUFACTURERS OF

**WRITING, WRAPPING,  
TOILET, "ANTI-RUST,"  
AND MEDICATED PAPERS.**

**Principal Office, Albany, N. Y.**

Branch Offices: NEW YORK, CHICAGO, BOSTON.

LONDON: British Patent Perforated Paper Company,  
Limited, Banner Street, St. Luke's, E. C.

**Manilla, White, and Colored Wrapping Paper  
in Rolls,**

**ALL SIZES AND WEIGHTS.**

**Anti-Rust Wrapping Paper for Bright Goods.**

**PERFECT PROTECTION AGAINST INJURY FROM  
DAMPNESS.**

## OUR MEDICATED PAPER

For sufferers from Hemorrhoids has proved a most successful vehicle for emollient and astringent remedies, affording a means of securing for chronic cases that regular, persistent treatment without which the advice and remedies of the ablest physicians fail to relieve.

This paper, heavily charged with an ointment approved by the profession, offers a method of treatment free from the inconvenience and annoyance attending the use of other remedies. The itching type of the disease quickly yields to its influence.

We submit a few extracts from the many letters we receive as to the value of our Medicated Paper. The originals may be seen at our office.

31 SUMMIT ST., BOSTON, MASS. July 1, 1893.  
A. P. W. PAPER CO.

GENTLEMEN,—Your Medicated Toilet Paper is useful in the treatment of Anal diseases, allaying to a great extent the intense itching, is a remedy easily applied, and a trial is convincing of its merits.

F. M. JOHNSON, M.D.

It is a decided pleasure to find an advertised article possessing real merit. I enclose \$1 for a further supply.

NEW YORK, April 5, 1893.

FROM A PHYSICIAN.—I am much pleased with your sample of Medicated Paper. Please send me eight packages and pocket case for \$1 enclosed.

NEW HAVEN, Feb. 1, 1893.

My physician recommends your Medicated Paper, and I enclose \$1 for eight packets with pocket case.

NEW HARTFORD, IOWA, Aug. 11, 1887.

We cannot do without your Medicated Paper. Send two dollars' worth at once.

PITTSBURGH, PA., Aug. 7, 1887.

I enclose Postal Note for four rolls Medicated Paper, the best remedy we have ever found.

NORRISTOWN, PA., Dec. 15, 1893.

A. P. W. PAPER CO.

GENTLEMEN,—Having recommended your Medicated Paper to a number of my patients suffering from Hemorrhoids, I find it of great benefit in preventing the intense itching, and in some cases has made a permanent cure.

Pocket Packet, Price per Roll of 1000 Sheets, securely wrapped in Tin Foil, Eight Packets and Nest Pocket Case, Two 1000-Sheet Rolls, and Nickel Fixture, Delivered Free, anywhere in the United States, on receipt of price. Address,

**Albany Perforated Wrapping Paper Co.—ALBANY, N. Y.**

NEW YORK, April 18, 1893.

Your Medicated Paper has been used with most gratifying result. It is a splendid remedy and has my unqualified endorsement. Please send two 1000-sheet rolls.

LEEDON, D. T., April 30, 1893.

Your Medicated Paper is a bonanza in my family; has relieved two cases of long standing. I enclose \$1 for two rolls.

CUSTOM, IOWA, Aug. 8, 1887.

I have tried your Medicated Paper, find it good, and enclose one dollar for further supply.

ARIZONA, PINAL CO., ARIZONA, June 14, 1891.

Please send me ten rolls of your most excellent Medicated Paper.

GRETHA, I.A., Aug. 1, 1897.

I have suffered for years until relieved by your Medicated Paper. Enclosed find two dollars for more of it.

UNIVERSITY, MISS., July 5, 1897.

I have had great benefit from your Medicated Paper, and enclose Postal Note for another roll.

SEBASTIA, MO., July 15, 1887.

I enclose one dollar, for which please send me pocket packages of your most excellent Medicated Paper.

DEMOPOLIS, ALA., July 29, 1887.

I find your Medicated Paper better than any I have ever used. Send me one dollar's worth in small packages, as I carry it with me.

DENVER, COL., April 12, 1887.

I have found your Medicated Paper superior to any I ever saw, and enclose one dollar for more of it.

\$0.10  
0.50  
1.00  
1.50

# ROYAL



# BAKING POWDER

**Absolutely Pure.**

This powder never varies. A marvel of purity, strength, and wholesomeness. More economical than the ordinary kinds, and cannot be sold in competition with the multitude of low test, short weight alum or phosphate powders. *Sold only in cans.* ROYAL BAKING POWDER CO., 106 Wall Street, New York.

GRATEFUL—COMFORTING.

# EPPS'S COCOA

**BREAKFAST.**

"By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected Cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast-tables with a delicately flavored beverage which may save us many heavy doctor's bills. It is by the judicious use of such articles of diet that a constitution may be gradually built up until strong enough to resist every tendency to disease. Hundreds of subtle maladies are floating around us ready to attack wherever there is a weak point. We may escape many a fatal shaft by keeping ourselves well fortified with pure blood and a properly nourished frame."—*Civil Service Gazette.*

Made simply with boiling water or milk. Sold only in half-pound tins by Grocers, labelled thus:

**JAMES EPPS & CO.,**

Homeopathic Chemists,

London, England.

When two brands of the same sort of goods are selling side by side in the market, one bringing double the price of the other, what is it that enables the former to find sale? Always because it is worth that much more; because it will wear longer, do better service while it lasts, keep one satisfied with his purchase instead of kicking himself for a fool all the time he has it, be reliable at the sharpest emergency instead of liable to give out just when it is needed most. And the concern dealing in such goods *has* to charge more for them, because it costs more to make them. That is exactly why THE TRAVELERS charges more for its Accident Policies than its competitors, why they are worth more, and why it can get more and do a greater business than they despite its higher rates. The rates are the lowest that permanent surety of paying all claims when due will justify. It paid claimants about \$1,400,000 in 1887, and has paid them over \$15,000,000 altogether. "Moral: Insure in THE TRAVELERS.

